arXiv:1601.02084v1 [math.DG] 9 Jan 2016

Construction of Compact Special Lagrangian T^2-conifolds

Yohsuke Imagi

Kavli IPMU (WPI)

Abstract

We construct compact special Lagrangian T^2-conifolds, which are stable in the sense of Joyce [18, §3.2] and theoretically well-studied, but the existence of which has been unproven so far as we know. Our construction starts with explicit algebro-geometric data, and uses a gluing technique in non-linear analysis initiated by Taubes.

1 Introduction

This paper is motivated by a series of work by Joyce [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21], Haskins [11] and the present author [13], all concerning special Lagrangian submanifolds with a simple class of singularity. Amongst them we focus on special Lagrangian C-folds, i.e. special Lagrangian real 3-folds with isolated singular points modelled on a multiplicity-one T^2-cone $C \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ given by

$$C := \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |z_1| = |z_2| = |z_3|,\ \mathrm{Re}\, z_1 z_2 z_3 \geq 0,\ \mathrm{Im}\, z_1 z_2 z_3 = 0\}. \tag{1.1}$$

We shall recall in §2 below the more precise definition of special Lagrangian C-folds. The T^2-cone C is one of the oldest examples of special Lagrangian submanifolds, contained in Harvey–Lawson's historic paper [10, Chapter III.3.A, Theorem 3.1] that introduced the notion of special Lagrangian submanifolds.

The more recent works cited above started with Joyce's attempt [15] to define an enumerative invariant that counts special Lagrangian homology 3-spheres, which requires a careful study of the singularity of compact special Lagrangian 3-folds. The general singularity seems too complicated to deal with by the current technology, but Joyce [21, §10] and the present author [13] developed a fairly good theory on the simple class of singularity modelled on the T^2-cone C above; we determined indeed all the smoothings of compact special Lagrangian C-folds.

Presumably to the reader's surprise we have *not* known whether there exist compact special Lagrangian C-folds; we note that C is itself a *non*-compact

special Lagrangian C-fold and the problem is to 'compactify' it. This paper proves that we can do it so that there exist compact special Lagrangian C-folds.

The basic idea of the proof is due to Haskins and Joyce so far as I am concerned. I learnt it from Joyce when I visited Oxford in March 2012, and subsequently discussed it with Haskins several times, especially during my visit to Imperial College London in November 2014. I thank Haskins and Joyce for sharing their idea with me.

The proof contains a concrete method of construction. The main technique goes back to Taubes' *gluing* construction [29] of Yang–Mills instantons, which is now applied to various objects in non-linear analysis, including special Lagrangian submanifolds. Some references in special Lagrangian geometry are Lee [22], Joyce [19, 20], Chan [2, 4, 5] and Pacini [27].

There are mainly two steps in the gluing method: the first is to find some (explicit) input data to glue together into an approximate solution (by a partition of unity); the second is to deform it to a true solution (by Implicit Function Theorem). There is in general some obstruction to the deformation in the second step, but in our case the obstruction (given by Joyce [18, Definition 6.8]) *vanishes* because C is a stable cone in Joyce's terminology [18, §3.2].

The first step, to find the input data, is more technical. We start with a compact Calabi–Yau *nodal* 3-fold N over $\mathbb{C}$, whose singular points are all isolated and modelled on the quadric hypersurface $Q \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ defined by the equation $xw - yz = 0$. We choose N that has an anti-holomorphic involution $\iota : N \to N$ whose fixed-point set $X \subset N$ is a compact special Lagrangian 3-fold whose singular points are all isolated and modelled on a certain T^2-cone $K \subset Q$.

Compact special Lagrangian C-folds are defined in Calabi–Yau *non-singular* 3-folds and we therefore choose N that has a projective small resolution $\Pi_N : \widetilde{N} \to N$ where 'small' means that at each singular point n of N its exceptional set $\Pi_N^{-1}(n)$ is bi-holomorphic to $\mathbb{CP}^1$ and its normal bundle in $\widetilde{N}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ over $\mathbb{CP}^1$.

Using a well-known method of symmetry we explicitly construct (in §7 below) a non-compact special Lagrangian C-fold $Y \subset \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ overlapping near infinity the T^2-cone $K \subset Q$ where Q outside the origin $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^4$ is identified with $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ outside its zero-section $\mathbb{CP}^1$.

Thus X approaches K at the singular points of X whereas Y overlaps K near infinity in $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ so that X, Y may be glued together over K.

The ambient space $\widetilde{N}$ may be obtained from $N, \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ by gluing to N a copy of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ at each singular point of N. In that sense we perform a simultaneous gluing of ambient spaces and their submanifolds. It is more-or-less standard and done by Chan [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], for example, in a similar context that we explain next.

Chan defines a differential-geometric notion of Calabi–Yau cones with isolated singularity, and Calabi–Yau conifolds whose singular points are all isolated and modelled on Calabi–Yau cones. He supposes given a compact Calabi–Yau conifold N with finitely many singular points $x_1, \cdots, x_l$ modelled on some Calabi–Yau cones $Q_1, \cdots, Q_l$ respectively, and a compact special Lagrangian

conifold X with the same singular points $x_1, \cdots, x_l$ modelled on some multiplicity-one special Lagrangian cones $K_1, \cdots, K_l$ in $Q_1, \cdots, Q_l$ respectively.

To resolve the singularity of N and X simultaneously he also supposes given some non-compact Calabi–Yau manifolds $M_1, \cdots, M_l$ asymptotic at infinity to $Q_1, \cdots, Q_l$ respectively, and non-compact special Lagrangian submanifolds $S_1, \cdots, S_l$ asymptotic at infinity to $K_1, \cdots, K_l$ respectively. Under a suitable hypothesis he then glues $M_1, \cdots, M_l$ to N at $x_1, \cdots, x_l$ respectively, and simultaneously $S_1, \cdots, S_l$ to X at the same points $x_1, \cdots, x_l$ respectively, to get a Calabi–Yau manifold and its special Lagrangian submanifold, both compact and non-singular.

Thus the rôle of our Q, K, $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ and Y is similar to that of Chan's $(Q_1, \cdots, Q_l)$, $(K_1, \cdots, K_l)$, $(M_1, \cdots, M_l)$ and $(S_1, \cdots, S_l)$ where Y has a T^2-cone singularity but it is stable in Joyce's sense and so well-controlled as explained above.

Chan however supposes that $Q_1, \cdots, Q_l$, N and $M_1, \cdots, M_l$ have *Ricci-flat* Kähler metrics with suitable properties. In our case the existence of such metrics on Q, $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ is proven by Tanno [28] and Candelas–de la Ossa [1], but that on N has been *unproven* so far as we know.

It does matter in Chan's situation, but not in ours; we use indeed Ricci-*non*-flat Kähler metrics on all the ambient spaces relevant to us. Here we recall that Harvey–Lawson's original definition [10] of special Lagrangian submanifolds certainly involves Ricci-flat Kähler metrics, but it readily extends to *arbitrary* Kähler metrics as explained by Joyce [21, Definition 2.9] for instance.

Our Ricci-non-flat Kähler metrics are all constructed explicitly by elementary techniques, not containing analysis. For instance we define N as a complex hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}^4$ and use a Kähler metric on $\mathbb{CP}^4$ restricted to N; in taking the Kähler metric on $\mathbb{CP}^4$ however there is an *infinite-dimensional* freedom and so far from Ricci-flat is the induced metric on N.

Perhaps worth mentioning is that Haskins and Joyce initially supposed that N should have a Ricci-flat Kähler metric as Chan did. We remark that Chan's work contains the definition of (general) Calabi–Yau conifolds, that Ricci-flatness therein play an important rôle, and that the study of Ricci-flat Kähler metrics is itself of independent interest. On the other hand our main concern is only in special Lagrangian C-folds; the rôle of Calabi–Yau conifolds is rather auxiliary in our treatment and we are concerned, moreover, only with Calabi–Yau nodal 3-folds, a particular simple class of Calabi–Yau conifolds.

The remaining sections will be devoted to the rigorous treatment of the material above, and we shall proceed as follows.

§2 defines special Lagrangian T^2-conifolds; §3 constructs the Kähler metrics on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, $\widetilde{N}$; and §4 makes a general statement of our gluing construction, to be proven in §§7–8 and §§10–14 (where §14 is the last section of this paper).

§5 gives an example of N (and of X) which combined with the statement of §4 implies the existence of compact special Lagrangian C-folds.

§6 and §9 are devoted to a topology of compact special Lagrangian 3-folds concerned with §5. I thank Kei Irie and Toru Yoshiyasu for helpful conversations about it during East Asian Symplectic Conference 2015 in Hong Kong.

We remark that §5 gives only one kind of $X \subset N$ and consequently we get only one kind of compact special Lagrangian C-folds. No other examples will be pursued in this paper.

I thank Haskins for teaching me some basic facts about projective small resolutions of nodal 3-folds, which was helpful in preparing §3, and Johannes Nordström for helping me to prepare §5.

It is not directly relevant to the present topic but may be worth mentioning that Corti, Haskins, Nordström and Pacini [7, 8] perform a gluing construction of compact G_2-manifolds and associative submanifolds, using more sophisticated techniques in algebraic geometry than we do in §3.

I also thank Haskins for informing me that Pacini [27] already performs a gluing construction close to ours; Pacini constructs some *non-compact asymptotically-conical* special Lagrangian C-folds, the analytical treatment of which is similar to compact ones. We use indeed (in §§11–14) a version of Pacini's norms (to be explained in §11).

One delicate thing is that in gluing Y to X (in §8) we dilate $Y \subset \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ only in the fibres of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ over $\mathbb{CP}^1$ and its effect is like that in real dimension 2 though Y is of real dimension 3. We adjust it in (13.3) with an extra factor w_ϵ^{-1}.

This makes our treatment (in §8 and §§12–14) slightly different from Pacini's and we therefore give a self-contained account of our approach.

The material of §§10–11 is standard but contains some basic notation necessary for §§12–14.

I thank Imperial College London, Kavli IPMU and Kyoto University for giving me nice environments whilst I was preparing this paper. I also thank Ryushi Goto, Kota Hattori and Shinichiroh Matsuo for helpful conversations at an early stage of this work.

2 Special Lagrangian T^2-conifolds

This section will be devoted to the definition of special Lagrangian T^2-conifolds in Calabi–Yau either non-singular or nodal 3-folds over $\mathbb{C}$. The non-singular case is treated in detail by Joyce [17] so that we shall only briefly recall what we need, with a minor change of notation and terminology. We extend it to the nodal case, which will be straight-forward and elementary, but it may be worth recalling (from §1) that the ambient nodal 3-folds will be equipped with Ricci-*non*-flat Kähler metrics (induced by a projective embedding), unlike the definition by Chan [2, 3, 4, 5, 6].

We first define Calabi–Yau non-singular (complex) 3-folds and special Lagrangian (real) 3-folds:

Definition 2.1. A *Calabi–Yau non-singular 3-fold* means a triple (M, ω, Ω) with the following three properties: **(i)** M is a complex manifold of complex dimension 3; **(ii)** ω is a Kähler form on M; **(iii)** Ω is a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form on M.

If (M, ω, Ω) is a Calabi–Yau non-singular 3-fold then a *special Lagrangian non-singular 3-fold* in (M, ω, Ω) means a smooth submanifold $S \subset M$ of real dimension 3 with $\omega|_S = \operatorname{Im}\Omega|_S = 0$ where $\operatorname{Im}\Omega$ denotes the imaginary part of Ω or more explicitly $\operatorname{Im}\Omega = \frac{1}{2i}(\Omega - \overline{\Omega})$.

Example 2.2. The T^2-cone C given by (1.1) is singular at $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^3$ but $C' := C \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is a special Lagrangian non-singular 3-fold in $\mathbb{C}^3 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ with respect to the Kähler form $\frac{i}{2}\sum_{j=1}^3 dz_j \wedge d\overline{z_j}$ and the nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form $dz_1 \wedge dz_2 \wedge dz_3$ in the co-ordinates z_1, z_2, z_3 on $\mathbb{C}^3$.

The following lemma is well-known, giving a concrete method of constructing special Lagrangian submanifolds:

Lemma 2.3. *Let (M, ω, Ω) be a Calabi–Yau non-singular 3-fold. Suppose given a diffeomorphism $\Phi : M \to M$ with $\Phi^*\omega = -\omega$ and $\Phi^*\Omega = \overline{\Omega}$. Then the fixed-point set of Φ is either empty or a special Lagrangian non-singular 3-fold in (M, ω, Ω).*

To define special Lagrangian C-folds we need some preparation. We denote by $\mathbb{R}_+$ the set of all real numbers > 0 and define the *radius function* $r : C' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as the Euclidean distance from $\mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$. Given a neighbourhood U of $\mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$ and a smooth function $f : C' \cap U \to \mathbb{R}$ we say that f decays with rate > 2 if the weighted C^k-norms $\|r^{-\lambda} f\|_{C^k(C' \cap U)}$ are finite for k an arbitrary integer $\geqslant 0$ and λ an arbitrary real number > 2.

Following Joyce [17, Theorem 4.3] we take a Weinstein neighbourhood of C' in $\mathbb{C}^3$ compatible with the $\mathbb{R}_+$-dilation upon $C, \mathbb{C}^3$ respectively. The dilation on C' lifts to the co-tangent bundle T^*C' so that the co-tangent vectors will be dilated by t^2 for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. With respect to those $\mathbb{R}_+$-actions there exist an $\mathbb{R}_+$-invariant neighbourhood U_C of C' in T^*C' (where C' is identified with the zero-section of T^*C'), an $\mathbb{R}_+$-invariant neighbourhood V_C of C' in $\mathbb{C}^3$, and an $\mathbb{R}_+$-equivariant diffeomorphism $\Phi_C : U_C \to V_C$ with the following two properties: (i) Φ_C restricted to C' is the identity map; (ii) the symplectic form $\frac{i}{2}\sum_{j=1}^3 dz_j \wedge d\overline{z_j}$ on $V_C \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is pulled back by Φ_C to the canonical symplectic form on $U_C \subset T^*C'$.

We are ready now to define special Lagrangian C-folds. The following definition treats only those special Lagrangian C-folds with just one singular point, which will suffice for the later application, whereas Joyce [17, Definition 3.6] deals with finitely many singular points:

Definition 2.4. Let (M, ω, Ω) be a Calabi–Yau non-singular 3-fold, let $x \in M$, let X be a closed subset of M and let $X' := X \setminus \{x\}$ be a special Lagrangian submanifold of (M, ω, Ω). We call X a *special Lagrangian C-fold* in (M, ω, Ω) if there exist a diffeomorphism $\Phi_x : U_x \to V_x$ and a smooth function $f : C' \cap U_x \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following two properties:

(i) U_x, V_x are neighbourhoods of $\mathbf{0}, x$ in $\mathbb{C}^3, M$ respectively and Φ_x is such that $\Phi_x(\mathbf{0}) = x$ with $\Phi_x^*\Omega|_{\mathbf{0}} = dz_1 \wedge dz_2 \wedge dz_3$ and $\Phi_x^*\omega = \frac{i}{2}\sum_{j=1}^3 dz_j \wedge d\overline{z_j}$;

(ii) f decays with rate > 2 with $\operatorname{Graph} df = \Phi_x^{-1}(X' \cap V_x)$.

We turn now to Calabi–Yau *nodal* 3-folds. As a local model we use the quadric hypersurface $Q \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ defined by the equation $xw - yz = 0$ in the co-ordinates x, y, z, w on $\mathbb{C}^4$. Under a suitable co-ordinate change it may be re-written as $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + w^2 = 0$ because $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + w^2 = (x + iy)(x - iy) + (z + iw)(z - iz)$. This implies that Q has an isolated singular point at $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^4$, called an ordinary double point or a node.

We denote by θ the Kähler form $\frac{i}{2}(dx \wedge d\bar{x} + dy \wedge d\bar{y} + dz \wedge d\bar{z} + dw \wedge d\bar{w})$ on $\mathbb{C}^4$. We shall restrict θ to $Q' := Q \setminus \{0\}$ wherever necessary in later treatments.

We can consider holomorphic 3-forms on Q (rather than on Q') as Q is a complex analytic space. There is a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form Θ on Q expressed as the residue of the meromorphic 4-form $dx \wedge dy \wedge dz \wedge dw$ so that

$$\Theta := dy \wedge dz \wedge dw / \tfrac{\partial(xw-yz)}{\partial x} = dy \wedge dz \wedge dw / w \tag{2.1}$$

wherever $w \neq 0$ for instance.

We define a T^2-cone K in Q by setting

$$K := \{(x, y, \bar{y}, \bar{x}) \in \mathbb{C}^4 : x, y \in \mathbb{C}, |x| = |y|\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Lemma 2.3 applied to the the involution $(x, y, z, w) \mapsto (\bar{w}, \bar{z}, \bar{y}, \bar{x})$ implies that $K' := K \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is a special Lagrangian submanifold of (Q', θ, Θ).

We can now define (general) nodal 3-folds as complex analytic spaces with singularity locally modelled on Q. We shall treat however only those expressible as a hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}^4$, which will suffice for the later application.

Let N be an algebraic hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}^4$ defined by a homogeneous quintic equation $F = 0$. We denote by $\operatorname{Sing} N$ the set of singular points of N. We suppose that N is *nodal*, which means that for any $n \in \operatorname{Sing} N$ there exist a neighbourhood U of n in $\mathbb{CP}^4$ and some local inhomogeneous co-ordinates x, y, z, w on U with $F|_U = xw - yz$.

Let ω be a Kähler form on $\mathbb{CP}^4$. We shall restrict ω to N' wherever necessary in later treatments.

Let Ω be a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form on N (rather than on N') which exists as F is quintic (as the residue of a meromorphic 4-form on $\mathbb{CP}^4$). Now we make:

Definition 2.5. The triple (N, ω, Ω) is called a *Calabi–Yau* nodal 3-fold.

The definition of compact special Lagrangian K-folds in (N, ω, Ω) will be similar to Definition 2.4 and we therefore need some similar preparation. We first put $K' := K \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and define the *radius function* $r : K' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as the Euclidean distance from $\mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{C}^4$. It then makes sense to say that a smooth function $f : K' \cap U \to \mathbb{R}$, where U denotes a neighbourhood of $\mathbf{0}$ in Q, decays with rate > 2.

We also take a Weinstein neighbourhood of K' in Q similar to that of C' in $\mathbb{C}^3$. We first define $\mathbb{R}_+$-dilations upon K, Q and T^*K similar to those on $C, \mathbb{C}^3$ and T^*C respectively. We then take an $\mathbb{R}_+$-invariant neighbourhood U_K

of K' in T^*K' (where K' is identified with the zero-section of T^*K'), an $\mathbb{R}_+$-invariant neighbourhood V_K of K' in Q, and an $\mathbb{R}_+$-equivariant diffeomorphism $\Phi_K : U_K \to V_K$ with the following two properties: (i) Φ_K restricted to K' is the identity map; (ii) the Kähler form θ on $V_K \subset Q$ is pulled back by Φ_K to the canonical symplectic form on $U_K \subset T^*K'$.

We are ready now to define compact special Lagrangian K-folds in (N, ω, Ω). We again treat only those with just one singular point, which will still suffice for the later application:

Definition 2.6. Let $x \in \operatorname{Sing} N$, let $X \subset N$ be compact, let $X' := X \setminus \{x\} \subset N'$ and let X' be a special Lagrangian non-singular 3-fold in (N', ω, Ω). We call X a *special Lagrangian K-fold* in (N, ω, Ω) if there exist a map $\Phi_x : U_x \to V_x$ and a smooth function $f : K' \cap U_x \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following two properties:

(i) U_x, V_x are neighbourhoods of $\mathbf{0}, x$ in Q, N respectively and Φ_x extends to a diffeomorphism between open subsets of $\mathbb{C}^4, \mathbb{CP}^4$ containing U_x, V_x respectively so that $\Phi_x(\mathbf{0}) = x$, $\Phi_x^*\Omega|_{\mathbf{0}} = \Theta$ and $\Phi_x^*\omega = \theta$;

(ii) f decays with rate > 2 with $\operatorname{Graph} df = \Phi_K^{-1}(X' \cap V_x)$.

3 Kähler Forms on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, $\widetilde{N}$

This section will resolve the nodal 3-folds Q, N into non-singular 3-folds $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, $\widetilde{N}$ respectively and construct thereon some Kähler forms (under a suitable hypothesis on N). Our treatment will be differential-geometric rather than algebro-geometric in the following sense: in constructing Kähler forms on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, $\widetilde{N}$ we change the Kähler forms on Q, N only in a small (analytic) neighbourhood of some divisor in Q, N respectively.

We shall proceed in two subsections, dealing with $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, $\widetilde{N}$ respectively.

3.1 Kähler Forms on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$

We first consider the quadric $Q \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ defined by the equation $xw - yz = 0$. There is a complex plane $P \subset Q$ defined by the equation $x = y = 0$. The *blow-up* of P in Q may be defined as the map $\Pi_Q : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to Q$ where

$$\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} := \{(x, y, z, w, u : v) \in \mathbb{C}^4 \times \mathbb{CP}^1 : xv - yu = zv - wu = 0\} \tag{3.1}$$

and $\Pi_Q(x, y, z, w, u : v) = (x, y, z, w) \in Q$.

We define a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form $\widetilde{\Theta}$ on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ by letting Θ be as in (2.1) and setting

$$\widetilde{\Theta} := \Pi_Q^*\Theta = dy \wedge d\Big(\frac{u}{v}\Big) \wedge dw \tag{3.2}$$

wherever $v \neq 0$ for instance.

We define a Kähler form $\tilde{\theta}$ on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ as follows. Let θ be as in §2. We take a compactly-supported smooth function $\chi : [0, \infty) \to [0, 1]$ with $\chi|_{[0,1]} \equiv 1$

and $\chi|_{[1,2]} \equiv 0$. We define $r : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to [0,\infty)$ by $r := \sqrt{|x|^2 + |y|^2}$ where x, y are as in (3.1). As $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ is a holomorphic vector bundle over $\mathbb{CP}^1$ we may identify $\mathbb{CP}^1$ with the zero-section of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$. On $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \setminus \mathbb{CP}^1$ we set

$$\tilde{\theta} := \Pi_Q^* \theta + \delta \frac{i}{2} \partial\overline{\partial} \log\big(\chi(r^2) r^2 + 1 - \chi(r^2)\big) \tag{3.3}$$

which extends across $\mathbb{CP}^1$ and defines a closed $(1,1)$-form on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, as the $\partial\overline{\partial}\log$ term of (3.3) is the *curvature of a Hermitian metric on the holomorphic line bundle* $-\big[\widetilde{P}\big]$ over $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ where $\widetilde{P}$ denotes the strict transform of P under $\Pi_Q : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to Q$. The expression (3.3) also implies:

Theorem 3.1. *For δ small enough the closed $(1,1)$-form $\tilde{\theta}$ is positive-definite and so defines a Kähler form on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$.*

3.2 Kähler Forms on $\widetilde{N}$

We turn now to a Calabi–Yau nodal 3-fold (N, ω, Ω) in the sense of Definition 2.5. We suppose (as in §1) that there exists a projective small resolution $\Pi_N : \widetilde{N} \to N$; we shall actually suppose that Π_N is the (successive) blow-up of some (finitely many) smooth divisors in N (which is automatically projective small).

We first define the blow-up of a smooth divisor in N; a *smooth divisor* in N means a compact complex manifold embedded in N of complex co-dimension 1. If a smooth divisor D_1 passes though a singular point n of N then one easily sees that $D_1 \subset N$ may be locally identified with $P \subset Q$ respectively; more precisely there exist a neighbourhood U_n of $\mathbf{0}$ in Q, a neighbourhood V_n of n in N, and a bi-holomorphic map $\mathrm{F}_n : U_n \to V_n$ with $\mathrm{F}_n(\mathbf{0}) = n$ and $\mathrm{F}_n^{-1}(D_1 \cap V_n) = P \cap U_n$. We choose such $\mathrm{F}_n : U_n \to V_n$ for all $n \in D_1 \cap \operatorname{Sing} N$ and then set

$$N_1 := \big(N \setminus (D_1 \cap \operatorname{Sing} N)\big) \cup \bigcup_{n \in D_1 \cap \operatorname{Sing} N} \Pi_Q^{-1}(U_n) \tag{3.4}$$

where each $p \in \Pi_Q^{-1}(U_n)$ is identified with $\mathrm{F}_n \circ \Pi_Q(p) \in N \setminus (D_1 \cap \operatorname{Sing} N)$. Clearly there exists a unique map $\Pi_1 : N_1 \to N$ which restricted to $N \setminus (D_1 \cap \operatorname{Sing} N)$ is the identity map and which restricted to $\Pi_Q^{-1}(U_n)$ is equal to Π_Q. The map $\Pi_1 : N_1 \to N$ is called the *blow-up* of D_1 in N.

To define the successive blow-up we suppose given another smooth divisor D_2 in N. One easily sees that its strict transform under $\Pi_1 : N_1 \to N$, i.e. the closure of $\Pi_1^{-1}\big(D_2 \setminus (D_1 \cap \operatorname{Sing} N)\big)$ in N_1, is a smooth divisor in N_1. We shall denote it simply by D_2 for brevity's sake. We can then blow up D_2 in N_1.

We suppose indeed that N has finitely many smooth divisors $D_1, \cdots, D_k$ with $\operatorname{Sing} N \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^k D_j$ so that blowing up $D_1, \cdots, D_k$ successively (which depends on the *order* of $D_1, \cdots, D_k$) we get a non-singular 3-fold $\widetilde{N}$ and a resolution map $\Pi_N : \widetilde{N} \to N$.

Now we make $\widetilde{N}$ into a family of Calabi–Yau 3-folds $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ parametrized by $\epsilon > 0$. We first set $\widetilde{\Omega} := \Pi_N^* \Omega$ which clearly defines a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form on $\widetilde{N}$.

The Kähler form $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ will differ from $\Pi_N^*\omega$ only in an ϵ-neighbourhood in $\widetilde{N}$ of the strict transform of $\bigcup_{j=1}^k D_j$ under $\Pi_N : \widetilde{N} \to N$. To construct $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ we shall repeat k times the process similar to (3.3).

Let $\Pi_1 : N_1 \to N$ be as above and define inductively on $j = 2, \cdots, k$ (if $k \geqslant 2$) a map $\Pi_j : N_j \to N_{j-1}$ as the blow-up of $D_j \subset N_{j-1}$ where D_j is identifed with the strict transform of $D_j \subset N$ under $\Pi_{j-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Pi_1 : N_{j-1} \to N$. We put $N_0 := N$ to make the notation consistent.

We fix $j = 1, \cdots, k$ for a moment. We denote by $\widetilde{D}_j$ the strict transform of D_j under $\Pi_j : N_j \to N_{j-1}$. We construct a Hermitian metric $h_{j,\epsilon}$ on the holomorphic line bundle $-\big[\widetilde{D}_j\big]$ over N_j.

We cover $\widetilde{D}_j$ by two kinds of open sets $U, V \subset N_j$ the former of which are those containing an exceptional set $\Pi_j^{-1}(n)$ over $n \in \operatorname{Sing} N_{j-1} \cap D_j$ and the latter of which are those away from the exceptional sets.

Making U small enough we may locally identify $\widetilde{D}_j \cap U$ with $\widetilde{P} \subset \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ so that we can define a function $r_U := \sqrt{|x|^2 + |y|^2}$ as an analogue to r in (3.3). Making V small enough we can define the smooth divisor $\widetilde{D}_j$ by the equation $s_V = 0$ for some holomorphic function $s_V : V \to \mathbb{C}$.

We take a partition of unity $\{\phi_U\} \cup \{\psi_V\}$ subordinate to the open cover $\{U \cap \widetilde{D}_j\} \cup \{V \cap \widetilde{D}_j\}$. As in (3.3) we use the cut-off function $\chi : [0, \infty) \to [0, 1]$. For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough we put

$$f_\epsilon := 1 - \sum_U \phi_U\Big(\frac{r_U^2}{\epsilon^2}\Big) - \sum_V \psi_V\Big(\frac{|s_V|^2}{\epsilon^2}\Big). \tag{3.5}$$

We can then define a Hermitian metric $h_{\epsilon,j}$ on $-\big[\widetilde{D}_j\big]$ by setting

$$h_{\epsilon,j} := \sum_U \phi_U \chi\Big(\frac{r_U^2}{\epsilon^2}\Big) r_U^2 - \sum_V \psi_V \chi\Big(\frac{|s_V|^2}{\epsilon^2}\Big) |s_V|^2 + f_\epsilon \tag{3.6}$$

which is clearly well-defined on $N_j \setminus \widetilde{D}_j$ and readily extends across $\widetilde{D}_j$.

The divisor $\widetilde{D}_j$ is unaffected under the blow-up of D_i for any $i > j$ and so may be identified with its strict transform under $\Pi_k \circ \cdots \circ \Pi_{j+1} : \widetilde{N} \to N_j$. We also identify $h_{\epsilon,j}$ with its pull-back under the same map.

Now we consider all $j = 1, \cdots, k$. Let $\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_k > 0$ and define a closed $(1,1)$-form $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ on $\widetilde{N} \equiv N_k$ by setting

$$\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon := \Pi_N^*\omega + \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_j \epsilon^2 \frac{i}{2} \partial\overline{\partial} \log h_{\epsilon,j} \tag{3.7}$$

which we have to make positive-definite.

We first consider the exceptional sets $\Pi_N^{-1}(\operatorname{Sing} N)$. For each $n \in \operatorname{Sing} N$ we denote by $j(n)$ the least index of those $D_1, \cdots, D_k$ containing n so that

$$\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon|_{\Pi_N^{-1}(n)} = \big(\delta_{j(n)} + \textstyle\sum_{i>j(n)} \pm\delta_i\big)\, \omega_{\mathrm{FS}} =: \delta(n)\, \omega_{\mathrm{FS}} \tag{3.8}$$

where ω_{FS} denotes the Fubini–Study $(1,1)$-form on $\Pi_N^{-1}(n) \cong \mathbb{CP}^1$. Consequently we can take $\delta_1 > \cdots > \delta_k > 0$ such that $\delta(n) > 0$ for all $n \in \operatorname{Sing} N$. With respect to these $\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_k$ we have:

Theorem 3.2. *There exists $\delta_* > 0$ depending only on $(N, \omega, D_1, \cdots, D_k)$, not on ϵ, and satisfying the following property: if $\delta_1 < \delta_*$ then $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ is a Kähler form on $\widetilde{N}$.*

Proof. This is similar to Theorem 3.1 and it suffices to prove that we can make δ_* independent of ϵ. We suppose $k = 1$ for brevity's sake; the general case may be dealt with by induction on k. We have only to make $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ positive-definite on each of the open sets U, V in the notation above.

We first consider U which may be identified with an open set in $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$. We take the co-ordinate system $(x, y, z, w, u : v)$ as in (3.1). We put $\boldsymbol{t} := (x, y, z, w)$ so that we may write $\Pi_N^* \omega =: \frac{i}{2} \sum_{a,b=1}^4 g_{a\bar{b}}(\boldsymbol{t}) dt^a \wedge d\overline{t^b}$. As $f_\epsilon = 0$ on U it follows from (3.6) that $h_{\epsilon,1} =: h_U(\boldsymbol{t}/\epsilon, \boldsymbol{t}, u : v)$ for some smooth function h_U independent of ϵ. Considering the dilation map $\Delta_\epsilon : (\boldsymbol{t}, u : v) \mapsto (\epsilon \boldsymbol{t}, u : v)$ we get

$$\Delta_\epsilon^* \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \epsilon^2 \frac{i}{2} \Big(\sum_{a,b=1}^4 g_{a\bar{b}}(\epsilon \boldsymbol{t}) dt^a \wedge d\overline{t^b} + \delta_1 \partial \overline{\partial} \log h_U(\boldsymbol{t}, \epsilon \boldsymbol{t}, u : v) \Big) \tag{3.9}$$

which is clearly positive-definite if $\delta_1 < \delta_*$ for some δ_* independent of ϵ.

On V we may take a local co-ordinate system $\boldsymbol{z} = (z^1, z^2, z^3)$, write $\Pi_N^* \omega = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{a,b=1}^3 g_{a\bar{b}}(\boldsymbol{z}) dz^a \wedge d\overline{z^b}$ and write $h_{\epsilon,1} = h_V(\boldsymbol{z}/\epsilon, \boldsymbol{z})$ for some h_V independent of ϵ. Considering the dilation map $\mathrm{D}_\epsilon : \boldsymbol{z} \mapsto \epsilon \boldsymbol{z}$ we get

$$\mathrm{D}_\epsilon^* \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \epsilon^2 \frac{i}{2} \Big(\sum_{a,b=1}^3 g_{a\bar{b}}(\epsilon \boldsymbol{z}) dz^a \wedge d\overline{z^b} + \delta_1 \partial \overline{\partial} \log h_V(\boldsymbol{z}, \epsilon \boldsymbol{z}) \Big) \tag{3.10}$$

which is clearly positive-definite if $\delta_1 < \delta_*$ for some δ_* independent of ϵ. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. □

Thus $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ is a Kähler form on $\widetilde{N}$ for $\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_k$ selected above.

4 General Statement of Construction

Now we make a general statement of constructing compact special Lagrangian C-folds.

Let (N, ω, Ω) be a Calabi–Yau nodal 3-fold in the sense of Definition 2.5, and let X be (as in Definition 2.6) a compact special Lagrangian K-fold in (N, ω, Ω) with only one singular point x. Let $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ be as in §3.2, a Calabi–Yau non-singular 3-fold associated to some (ordered) set of smooth divisors $D_1, \cdots, D_k$ in (N, ω, Ω).

The following hypothesis is rather technical, to be used only in the proof of Lemma 8.1 below:

Hypothesis 4.1. For each $j = 1, \cdots, k$ we have either $D_j \cap X = \emptyset$ or $D_j \cap X = \{x\}$, and if $D_j \cap X = \{x\}$ then we have $T_x D_j \cap T_x X = \{0\}$ where $T_x X$ denotes the tangent cone to X at x.

Our construction theorem may then be stated as follows:

Theorem 4.2. *Under Hypothesis* 4.1 *above there exists* $\epsilon_* > 0$ *such that for each* $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_*)$ *we can construct a compact special Lagrangian* C*-fold in* $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$.

The proof of Theorem 4.2 will be given in §7, §8 and §§10–14.

5 Example of Input Data

Now we give an example of the input data of Theorem 4.2. We shall give essentially only one example, and not try to find others.

We first define N as a quintic hypersurface $F = 0$ in $\mathbb{CP}^4$. To define F we introduce an auxiliary polynomial

$$\phi_c(u, v, t) = (u + v)^3 + 3uv(u + v) + ct^3,\ c > 0, \tag{5.1}$$

which is symmetric in u, v and homogeneous in u, v, t of degree 3. We denote by x, y, z, w, t the homogeneous co-ordinates of $\mathbb{CP}^4$ and set

$$F := xw\phi_a(x, w, t) - yz\phi_b(y, z, t) \tag{5.2}$$

where $a, b > 0$ and

$$\text{either } \tfrac{a}{b} \text{ or } \tfrac{b}{a} \text{ is large enough} \tag{5.3}$$

to justify Lemma 5.2 below.

The point of the choice of F is the following. Just to find Calabi–Yau nodal 3-folds it would suffice to consider

$$x\phi(x, y, z, w, t) - y\psi(x, y, z, w, t) = 0 \tag{5.4}$$

with ϕ, ψ *generic* amongst the homogeneous quartics. On the other hand we shall need an anti-holomorphic involution on $F = 0$ and therefore need F to be *symmetric* enough to have an involution. These two conditions appear incompatible, but we can balance them by considering polynomials of the form (5.2).

Now we prove that $F = 0$ defines a nodal 3-fold. We begin with:

Lemma 5.1. *The hypersurface* $F = 0$ *has no singular points at* $t = 0$.

Proof. A simple computation shows

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = w\big((x + w)^3 + 6xw(x + w) + at^3 + 3x(x + w)^2 + 3x^2 w\big), \tag{5.5}$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial w} = x\big((x + w)^3 + 6xw(x + w) + at^3 + 3w(x + w)^2 + 3xw^2\big) \tag{5.6}$$

and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial F}{\partial z}$ may be computed likewise. Set $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial w} = 0$.

We first prove $xw = 0$. If $xw \neq 0$ then dividing (5.5), (5.6) by w, x respectively and subtracting them we get $x = w$ or $(x+w)^2 + xw = 0$. If $x = w$ then setting $t = 0$ in (5.5) we get $xw = 0$. If $(x+w)^2 + xw = 0$ then setting $t = 0$ in (5.5) we get either $w = 0$ or $x + w = 0$; and if $x + w = 0$ then since $(x+w)^2 + xw = 0$ we get $x = w = 0$. This completes the proof that $xw = 0$.

If $x = 0$ for instance then setting $x = t = 0$ in (5.5) we get $w = 0$. Likewise if $w = 0$ then (5.6) implies $x = 0$. Consequently $x = w = 0$.

Since the computation of $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial F}{\partial z}$ is similar to (5.5), (5.6) we also get $y = z = 0$, which completes the proof of Lemma 5.1. □

Now we set $t = 1$, regard (x, y, z, w) an inhomogenous co-ordinate system and study therein the singular points of the hypersurface $F = 0$. We first note that the origin $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is a node modelled on the quadric $Q \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ defined by $xw - yz = 0$. To describe other singular points we introduce some notation. Since $a, b \neq 0$ it follows that $\phi_a(x, 0, 1), \phi_b(y, 0, 1)$ have three distinct roots $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}, \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\}$ respectively. By symmetry $\phi_a(0, w, 1), \phi_b(0, z, 1)$ have also the same roots $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}, \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\}$ respectively. We put $\alpha_0 = \beta_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Both $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ and $\{\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\}$ consist of 4 distinct elements and consequently for $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ the four points

$$\begin{aligned} &p_{x,y;i,j} := (0, 0, \beta_j, \alpha_i),\ p_{x,z;i,j} := (0, \beta_j, 0, \alpha_i), \\ &p_{w,y;i,j} := (\alpha_i, 0, \beta_j, 0),\ p_{w,z;i,j} := (\alpha_i, \beta_j, 0, 0) \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

are all nodes of the hypersurface $F = 0$. Now we use the hypothesis (5.3) to prove:

Lemma 5.2. *The singular points of $F = 0$ are all nodes and listed by* (5.7).

Proof. We first prove that if (x, y, z, w) is a singular point then $xyzw = 0$. For contradiction let $xyzw \neq 0$. Setting $t = 1$, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial w} = 0$ we use (5.5), (5.6) and similar formulae for $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial F}{\partial z}$. Dividing (5.5), (5.6) by w, x respectively and subtracting them (as we did in the proof of Lemma 5.1) we get $x = w$ or $(x+w)^2 + xw = 0$. If $x = w$ then (5.5) implies $35x^3 + a = 0$ so that

$$|xw\phi_a(x, w, 1)| = 21|x|^5 = \frac{21}{(35)^{5/3}} a^{5/3}. \tag{5.8}$$

If $(x+w)^2 + xw = 0$ then (5.5) implies $5(x+w)^3 = a$ so that

$$|xw\phi_a(x, w, 1)| = 3|x+w|^5 = \frac{3}{5^{5/3}} a^{5/3}. \tag{5.9}$$

On the other hand since $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial z} = 0$ we likewise get

$$|yz\phi_b(y, z, 1)| = \frac{21}{(35)^{5/3}} b^{5/3} \text{ or } \frac{3}{5^{5/3}} b^{5/3}. \tag{5.10}$$

Combining (5.8)–(5.10) with (5.3) we get $F \neq 0$, which contradicts that (x, y, z, w) is a point of the hypersurface $F = 0$. This completes the proof that $xyzw = 0$.

We next prove $xw = yz = 0$. As $xyzw = 0$ we may by symmetry suppose $yz = 0$. If $xw \neq 0$ then the computation above shows that either (5.8) or (5.9) would hold. Hence as $F = yz = 0$ we should get $a = 0$. This contradicts $a > 0$ and so completes the proof that $xw = yz = 0$.

It suffices now to prove that if $x = y = 0$ for instance then $w = \alpha_i$, $z = \beta_j$ so that $(x, y, z, w) = p_{x,y;i,j}$ as in (5.7). Using (5.5) and recalling the definition of α_i we readily get $w = \alpha_i$. We likewise get $z = \beta_j$, which completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. □

Now we denote by N the hypersurface $F = 0$ in $\mathbb{CP}^4$. We continue the use of the inhomogeneous co-ordinates x, y, z, w with $t = 1$. We denote by $P_{x,y} \subset N$ the complex projective plane defined by $x = y = 0$, which contains the singular points $p_{x,y;i,j}$. Likewise define three planes $P_{x,z}, P_{w,y}, P_{w,z}$ to cover the other singular points given by (5.7). These four planes will play the rôle of $D_1, \cdots, D_k$ with $k = 4$ in the notation of Theorem 4.2. The order of $P_{x,y}, P_{x,z}, P_{w,y}, P_{w,z}$ (in which we shall blow them up) is arbitrary.

The compact special Lagrangian K-fold $X \subset N$ is defined as the fixed-point set of the anti-holomorphic involution

$$\iota : (x, y, z, w) \mapsto (\bar{w}, \bar{z}, \bar{y}, \bar{x}) \tag{5.11}$$

which maps N onto itself because $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ in (5.2). The Kähler form ω is given by

$$\omega = \frac{i}{2}\partial\bar{\partial}\log(1 + a|x|^2 + b|y|^2 + b|z|^2 + a|w|^2) \tag{5.12}$$

so that $\iota^*\omega = -\omega$. The nowhere-vanishing holomorphic 3-form Ω on N is defined as the residue of the meromorphic 4-form $ab\,dx \wedge dy \wedge dz \wedge dw/F$ (which extends across $t = 0$ as F is quintic) so that $\iota^*\Omega = \overline{\Omega}$.

We have then to prove that X is a compact special Lagrangian K-fold in (N, ω, Ω). Lemma 5.2 readily implies that $X \cap \mathrm{Sing}\, N = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ where $\mathbf{0}$ is defined by $x = y = z = w = 0$. Lemma 2.3 then implies that $X \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is a special Lagrangian submanifold of (N', ω, Ω) where $N' := N \setminus \mathrm{Sing}\, N$. On the other hand changing the co-ordinates $(x, y, z, w) \mapsto (\sqrt{a}x, \sqrt{b}y, \sqrt{b}z, \sqrt{a}w)$ one easily sees that X is, near $\mathbf{0}$, modelled on the special Lagrangian T^2-cone K in (Q, θ, Θ) in the notation of §2. Thus X is a compact special Lagrangian K-fold in (N, ω, Ω).

One also easily checks Hypothesis 4.1; the four planes $P_{x,y}, P_{x,z}, P_{w,y}, P_{w,z}$ intersect X only at the singular point $\mathbf{0}$ of X and are not tangent to X at $\mathbf{0}$.

We have thus obtained an example of the input data of Theorem 4.2.

6 Topology of Example

This section will be devoted to a 3-manifold topology of the example above.

We first prove that there exists a neighbourhood U of $\mathbf{0}$ in X such that we have a diffeomorphism $X \setminus U \cong S^1 \times D^2$ as manifolds-with-boundary.

Each point of $X \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ may be written as $(x : y : \bar{y} : \bar{x} : t)$ with $|x|^2 + |y|^2 = 1$. We denote by U the region $\{t \geqslant T\}$ for some $T > 0$. We put $s := a|x|^2 - b|y|^2$. One easily finds that $X \setminus U$ is the union of the three regions given by $\{s \geqslant \sigma\}$, $\{s \leqslant -\sigma\}$ and $\{|s| \leqslant \sigma, |t| \leqslant T\}$ for some $\sigma > 0$. An elementary argument shows that for σ small enough the first and second regions are diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times D^2$ and that for T large enough the third is to $S^1 \times P$ where P denotes the 'pair of pants'. In (5.3) we may suppose $\frac{b}{a}$ large enough, by symmetry. One then finds that in gluing to $S^1 \times P$ the second region $\{s \leqslant -\sigma\}$ diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times D^2$ we may fix the S^1-factor (which we shall denote by S^1_1) and glue D^2 to P into the annulus $S^1 \times [0,1]$ (which we shall denote by $S^1_2 \times [0,1]$) to get $S^1_1 \times S^1_2 \times [0,1]$. One then glues to $S^1_1 \times S^1_2 \times [0,1]$ the first region $\{s \geqslant \sigma\}$ diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times D^2$; in that process we may identify S^1_2 with the S^1-factor of $S^1 \times D^2$ and glue D^2 to $S^1_1 \times [0,1]$ into another disc, to get a diffeomorphism $X \setminus U \cong S^1 \times D^2$ as we want.

Now we denote by Z_ϵ the compact special Lagrangian C-fold in $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ to be constructed by Theorem 4.2. We denote by z_ϵ the unique singular point of Z_ϵ and put $Z'_\epsilon := Z_\epsilon \setminus \{z_\epsilon\}$. The construction (in §7, §8 and §10 below) readily implies that Z_ϵ is homeomorphic to X and in particular that Z'_ϵ is diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$.

Joyce [21, §10.2] constructed smoothings of Z_ϵ. As is well-known (going back to Harvey–Lawson [10, Chapter III.3.A, Theorem 3.1]) there are three smoothing models for the T^2-cone C :

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &= \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |z_1|^2 - 1 = |z_2|^2 = |z_3|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_1 z_2 z_3 \geqslant 0, \operatorname{Im} z_1 z_2 z_3 = 0\},\\
L_2 &= \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |z_1|^2 = |z_2|^2 - 1 = |z_3|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_1 z_2 z_3 \geqslant 0, \operatorname{Im} z_1 z_2 z_3 = 0\},\\
L_3 &= \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |z_1|^2 = |z_2|^2 = |z_3|^2 - 1, \operatorname{Re} z_1 z_2 z_3 \geqslant 0, \operatorname{Im} z_1 z_2 z_3 = 0\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

They are all diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ so that gluing them to $Z'_\epsilon \cong S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ (just as 3-manifolds rather than special Lagrangian 3-folds) we get a compact 3-manifold $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ diffeomorphic to one of $S^1 \times S^2$, S^3 and the lens spaces; this is well-known as the genus-one Heegaard splitting, explained by Hempel [12, Chapter 2] for instance.

There is a further restriction in making $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ a Lagrangian submanifold of $\widetilde{N}$ and those $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ will be diffeomorphic to either $S^1 \times S^2$ or S^3 as we shall see in §9 below. Those diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times S^2$ may be realized as a special Lagrangian submanifold of $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ but those diffeomorphic to S^3 will be (special) Lagrangian with respect to a *deformation* of the Kähler form $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ on $\widetilde{N}$.

Joyce [21, §10.2] defines indeed a 'wall' in the space of Kähler classes on $\widetilde{N}$: to the wall there corresponds those $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times S^2$ obtained from one of L_1, L_2, L_3 (by gluing it to Z_ϵ); there are two sides outside the wall and, corresponding to them, two families of $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ diffeomorphic to S^3 obtained from the other two elements of L_1, L_2, L_3.

Joyce [21, §10.2] also treats the case where a family of special Lagrangian homology 3-spheres branches at the wall into two families of special Lagrangian

homology 3-spheres which, however, does not happen in our example.

The remaining sections (except §9) will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.2 outlined in §1.

7 Construction of Y

This section will be devoted to constructing a non-compact Calabi–Yau non-singular 3-fold Y in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$ which is singular only at one point $(\mathbf{0}, 0 : 1) \in \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ and *overlaps* K near infinity so that

$$Y \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4) = \Pi_Q^{-1}(K \setminus B_4) \tag{7.1}$$

where $B_r \subset Q$ denotes the open ball of radius $r > 0$ about $\mathbf{0} \in Q \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ (we give $\mathbb{C}^4$ the Euclidean metric).

One technical remark is that the Kähler form θ contains a small parameter $\delta > 0$ (as in Theorem 3.1) which we shall make yet smaller if necessary in what follows.

We use a well-known method of symmetry, and our construction is similar to that of Ionel and Min-Oo [14, Theorem 6.1] who constructed T^2-invariant special Lagrangian submanifolds of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ with respect to a Ricci-flat Kähler form (constructed by Candelas and de la Ossa [1]). Our Kähler form $\tilde{\theta}$ is Ricci-*non*-flat but we use the same T^2-action upon $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$: we write $(x, y, z, w, u : v) \in \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ as in (3.1), write $T^2 = \{(e^{i\phi}, e^{i\psi}) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \phi, \psi \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and set

$$(e^{i\phi}, e^{i\psi}) \cdot (x, y, z, w, u : v) := (e^{i\phi}x, e^{-i\psi}y, e^{i\psi}z, e^{-i\phi}w, e^{i(\phi+\psi)}u : v) \tag{7.2}$$

which clearly preserves $(\tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$.

With respect to this T^2-action and the Kähler form $\tilde{\theta}$ there exists a moment map $m : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ (where $\mathbb{R}^2$ is regarded as the Lie algebra of T^2) because $H^1(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}; \mathbb{R}) = H^1(\mathbb{CP}^1; \mathbb{R}) = 0$. An elementary computation shows that adding a constant to m if necessary we may write

$$m = \tfrac{1}{2}(|x|^2 - |w|^2 + \delta f, |z|^2 - |y|^2 + \delta f) \tag{7.3}$$

for some smooth function $f : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f = \frac{|u|^2}{|u|^2+|v|^2}$ near $\Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_1})$ and $f \equiv 0$ near $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4)$. Set

$$Y := m^{-1}(0, 0) \cap \{xw = yz \in [0, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{C}\}. \tag{7.4}$$

We first prove that $Y' := Y \setminus \{(\mathbf{0}, 0 : 1)\}$ is a smooth submanifold of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ of real dimension 3; in fact the map $Y' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ given by $(x, y, z, w, u : v) \mapsto xw = yz$ defines a principal T^2-bundle with respect to the T^2-action (7.2).

Since $f \equiv 0$ on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4)$ it follows that $Y \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4)$ may be identified with $K \setminus B_4$ as claimed in (7.1).

On the other hand $Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_1})$ is defined by the equation

$$|x|^2 - |w|^2 + \delta\frac{|u|^2}{|u|^2 + |v|^2} = |z|^2 - |y|^2 + \delta\frac{|u|^2}{|u|^2 + |v|^2} = 0, \ xw = yz \in [0, \infty).$$

An elementary computation then shows that on $Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_1})$ we have $v \neq 0$ and if we put $t = \frac{u}{v}$ then

$$|y|^2 = |w|^2 = \frac{\delta |t|^2}{1 - |t|^4}.$$

This expression readily implies that $Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_1})$ is singular only at $(\mathbf{0}, 0 : 1) \in \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ and the singularity is modelled on the multiplicity-one T^2-cone C given by (1.1).

The remaining region is $Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4} \setminus B_1)$. If we had $\delta = 0$ then $Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4} \setminus B_1)$ would be $\Pi_Q^{-1}(K \cap \overline{B_4} \setminus B_1)$. On the other hand $K \cap \overline{B_4} \setminus B_1$ is locally defined in Q by the three real equations

$$|x|^2 - |w|^2 = |y|^2 - |z|^2 = \operatorname{Im} xz (= \operatorname{Im} yz) = 0 \tag{7.5}$$

and the associated Jacobian matrix (of size 3×6 over $\mathbb{R}$) has full rank 3 on $K \cap \overline{B_4} \setminus B_1$. Making δ smaller if necessary therefore we may suppose that also full rank has the Jacobian matrix associated to the equation $m = \operatorname{Im} xz (= \operatorname{Im} yz) = 0$, which is a δ-perturbation of (7.5) because of (7.3). Consequently we have diffeomorphisms $Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4} \setminus B_1) \cong K \cap \overline{B_4} \setminus B_1 \cong [1, 2] \times T^2$.

Thus Y' is non-singular. It remains now only to prove that Y' is special Lagrangian in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$. We first prove $\tilde{\theta}|_{Y'} = 0$. Since the moment map $m : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is constant on Y' it follows that $\tilde{\theta}$ vanishes in the two linearly-independent directions given by the T^2-action. On the other hand Y' is of dimension 3 and to evaluate the 2-form $\tilde{\theta}$ we have to put one of those two directions. Consequently $\tilde{\theta}|_{Y'} = 0$.

We then prove $\operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Theta}|_{Y'} = 0$. As Y' does not intersect $\Pi_Q^{-1}(\mathbf{0})$ we may work in $Q \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \subset \mathbb{C}^4$. The T^2-action (7.2) then induces the two vector fields

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} = i\Big(x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \bar{x}\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}} - w\frac{\partial}{\partial w} - \bar{w}\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}}\Big),\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} = i\Big(-y\frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \bar{y}\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{y}} + z\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \bar{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}\Big).$$

On the other hand we may write $\widetilde{\Theta} = dy \wedge dz \wedge dw/w$ (wherever $w \neq 0$ for instance) so that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} \lrcorner \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \lrcorner \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Theta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} \lrcorner \operatorname{Im} (i\, dy \wedge dz) = y\, dz + z\, dy = d(\operatorname{Im} yz) = 0 \text{ on } Y'$$

as we want.

8 Gluing Y to X

Let X, $D_1, \cdots, D_k$, (N, ω, Ω) and $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ be as in Theorem 4.2. Let Y be as in §7. This section will be devoted to gluing Y to X at the (unique) singular point $x \in X$ into a compact Lagrangian C-fold $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ in $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ which is only approximately special.

We first recall from (3.8) that $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon|_{\Pi_N^{-1}(x)} = \epsilon^2\delta(x)\,\omega_{\mathrm{FS}}$. In §3.1 we have defined a Kähler form θ on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ parametrized by $\delta > 0$ and now we set $\delta = \delta(x)$.

In §7 we have constructed the non-compact special Lagrangian C-fold Y in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$ which is singular only at one point $(\mathbf{0}, 0; 1) \in \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ and overlaps K near infinity in the sense that $Y \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4) = \Pi_Q^{-1}(K \setminus B_4)$ where $\Pi_Q : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to Q$ is as in §2.

We dilate $Y \subset \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ by $\epsilon > 0$ in the fibres of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$; more explicitly, embedding $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ into $\mathbb{C}^4 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ as in (3.1), we define $\Delta_\epsilon : \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ by $(\boldsymbol{t}, u : v) \mapsto (\epsilon\boldsymbol{t}, u : v)$ for $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{C}^4$ and $(u : v) \in \mathbb{CP}^1$.

We shall glue $\Delta_\epsilon(Y)$ to X at x and therefore need some preparation. Let $\Phi_K : U_K \to V_K$, $\Phi_x : U_x \to V_x$ and $f : K' \cap U_x \to \mathbb{R}$ be as in Definition 2.6. We make ϵ so small that $\overline{B_{5\epsilon}} \subset U_x$. We put $\widetilde{U}_x := \Pi_Q^{-1}(U_x)$, $\widetilde{V}_x := \Pi_N^{-1}(V_x)$ and denote by $\widetilde{\Phi} : \widetilde{U}_x \to \widetilde{V}_x$ the unique diffeomorphism commuting with $\Phi : U_x \to V_x$ via Π_Q, Π_N. Making $\widetilde{U}_x, \widetilde{V}_x, U_K, V_K$ smaller if necessary we get:

Lemma 8.1. *There exists a diffeomorphism $\widetilde{\Psi}_x : \widetilde{U}_x \to \widetilde{V}_x$ satisfying the following three properties:*

- **(i)** *we have $\widetilde{\Psi}_x|_{\mathbb{CP}^1} = \widetilde{\Phi}_x|_{\mathbb{CP}^1}$, where $\mathbb{CP}^1$ is identified with the zero-section of $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, and $\widetilde{\Psi}_x, \widetilde{\Phi}_x$ have the same differential at each point of $\mathbb{CP}^1$ so that $\widetilde{\Psi}_x^*\widetilde{\Omega}|_{\mathbb{CP}^1} = \widetilde{\Theta}|_{\mathbb{CP}^1}$;*
- **(ii)** *on $\widetilde{U}_x$ we have $\widetilde{\Psi}_x^*\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \epsilon^2\Delta_{\epsilon *}\tilde{\theta}$;*
- **(iii)** *on $\Pi_Q^{-1}(V_K \setminus B_{4\epsilon})$ we have $\widetilde{\Psi}_x = \widetilde{\Phi}_x$ and in particular $\widetilde{\Psi}_x^*\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \Pi_Q^*\theta$.*

Proof. As $\widetilde{\Phi}_x^*\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon|_{\mathbb{CP}^1} = \epsilon^2\Delta_{\epsilon *}\tilde{\theta}|_{\mathbb{CP}^1} = \epsilon^2\delta(x)\,\omega_{\mathrm{FS}}$ we can apply Moser's technique [26] to get a diffeormorphism $\widetilde{\Psi}_x : \widetilde{U}_x \to \widetilde{V}_x$ satisfying the properties (i)–(ii) above. For (iii) we use Hypothesis 4.1, which implies that $\Phi_x(V_K \setminus B_{4\epsilon})$ is so far away from the divisors $D_1, \cdots, D_k$ that on $\Pi_Q^{-1}(V_K \setminus B_{4\epsilon})$ we have

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_x^*\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon = \widetilde{\Phi}_x^*\Pi_N^*\omega = \Pi_Q^*\Phi_x^*\omega = \Pi_Q^*\theta = \epsilon^2\Delta_{\epsilon *}\tilde{\theta}.$$

Consequently $\widetilde{\Phi}_x$ is unchanged on $\Pi_Q^{-1}(V_K \setminus B_{4\epsilon})$ in Moser's process, which implies (iii). This completes the proof of Lemma 8.1. □

Now we construct the compact Lagrangian C-fold $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon \subset \widetilde{N}$. We first take a smooth function $f_\epsilon : K' \cap U_x \setminus B_{4\epsilon} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f_\epsilon \equiv 0$ near $B_{4\epsilon}$ and $f_\epsilon \equiv f$ outside of $B_{5\epsilon}$. We then set

$$\widetilde{X}_\epsilon := \Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x) \cup \widetilde{\Psi}_x\big(\Pi_Q^{-1}\Phi_K(\mathrm{Graph}\, df_\epsilon) \cup \Delta_\epsilon(Y \cap \overline{B_4})\big). \tag{8.1}$$

We put $y := (\mathbf{0}, 0 : 1)$ and $\tilde{x} = \widetilde{\Psi}_x(y)$ which are the unique singular points of Y and $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ respectively. Lemma 8.1 (ii)–(iii) readily imply that $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon := \widetilde{X}_\epsilon \setminus \{\tilde{x}\}$ is Lagrangian in $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon)$.

In §§10–14 below (after some digression in the next section) we shall deform $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ to a compact special Lagrangian C-fold.

9 Supplement to §6

Let $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ be as in §6. Now we prove that $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ is diffeomorphic to either $S^1 \times S^2$ or S^3.

In (7.4) we have constructed a non-compact special Lagrangian C-fold Y in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$ overlapping K near infinity and we can likewise construct non-compact special Lagrangian *non-singular* 3-folds $Y_{a,b}$ in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$ overlapping K near infinity; more explicitly $Y_{a,b} := m^{-1}(a,b) \cap \{xw = yz \in [0,\infty)\}$ in the notation of (7.4) with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ close to 0 and satisfying one of the following three conditions:

$$\textbf{(I)}\ a > 0, b = 0; \textbf{(II)}\ a = 0, b > 0; \textbf{(III)}\ a = b < 0.$$

These three families of special Lagrangian non-singular 3-folds $Y_{a,b}$ are modelled on L_1, L_2, L_3 given by (6.1) respectively.

We can then re-construct $\widetilde{L}_\epsilon$ by gluing $Y_{a,b}$ to X (where X is as in §5). Recall from §5 that X is singular only at one point $\mathbf{0}$ and that $X' \equiv X \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. On the other hand $Y_{a,b}$ is, by construction, diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. We study the images of the natural maps of $H_1(S^1 \times S^1) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ into $H_1(X') \cong H_1(Y_{a,b}) \cong H_1(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Since K is a T^2-cone we can take two cycles

$$\{(e^{i\phi}, 1, 1, e^{-i\phi}) \in K \subset \mathbb{C}^4 : \phi \in \mathbb{R}\},\ \{(1, e^{i\psi}, e^{-i\psi}, 1) \in K \subset \mathbb{C}^4 : \psi \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

as a basis of $H_1(K) \cong H_1(S^1 \times S^1) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. We may then denote by vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ the elements of $H_1(S^1 \times S^1)$. Following carefully the construction of the diffeomorphisms $X' \cong Y_{a,b} \cong S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ one finds:

- the image of $H_1(S^1 \times S^1) \to H_1(X') \cong \mathbb{Z}$ is generated by the image of $(1,0) \in H_1(S^1 \times S^1)$;
- in Cases (I)–(III) above the image of $H_1(S^1 \times S^1) \to H_1(Y_{a,b}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ is generated by the image of $(1,0)$, $(0,1)$, $(-1,-1) \in H_1(S^1 \times S^1)$ respectively.

This readily implies that in Case (I) we can glue $Y_{a,b}$ to X into $S^1 \times S^2$ and in (II) or (III) we can glue $Y_{a,b}$ to X into S^3, as we have described in §5.

10 Deformation of $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$

We return now to the situation of §8 and explain how to deform $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$.

We first take a Weinstein neighbourhood of $Y' := Y \setminus \{y\}$ in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta})$ where we recall that $y \equiv (\mathbf{0}, 0 : 1) \in \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ is the unique singular point of Y. We can take indeed a neighbourhood U_Y of Y' in T^*Y' (where Y' is identified with the zero-section of T^*Y'), a neighbourhood V_Y of Y' in $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, and a diffeomorphism $\Phi_Y : U_Y \to V_Y$ with the following three properties: (i) Φ_Y restricted to Y' is the identity map; (ii) $\Phi_Y^* \tilde{\theta}$ is the canonical symplectic form on

$U_Y \subset T^*Y'$; and (iii) Φ_Y restricted to the fibres over $Y' \setminus \overline{B_4}$ may be identified with $\Phi_K : U_K \to V_K$ under the diffeomorphism $\Pi_Q : Y' \setminus \overline{B_4} \to K \setminus \overline{B_4}$.

The following notation will be convenient. Let $\widetilde{\Psi}_x : \widetilde{U}_x \to \widetilde{V}_x$ be as in Lemma 8.1. We put

$$Y^\epsilon := Y' \cap \Delta_\epsilon^{-1}(\widetilde{U}_x). \tag{10.1}$$

We denote by α_ϵ the exact 1-form on Y^ϵ with $\alpha_\epsilon = 0$ in $\Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})$ and $\alpha_\epsilon = \epsilon^{-2}\Pi_Q^* df_\epsilon$ outside of $\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4)$. Here ϵ^{-2} may be regarded as the effect of Δ_ϵ^{-1}. We can define a smooth embedding $\eta_\epsilon : Y^\epsilon \to \widetilde{N}$ by

$$\eta_\epsilon := \widetilde{\Psi}_x \circ \Delta_\epsilon \circ \Phi_Y \circ \alpha_\epsilon \tag{10.2}$$

so that by (8.1) we have

$$\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon = \Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x) \cup \eta_\epsilon\big(Y^\epsilon\big). \tag{10.3}$$

Some more notation we shall need. We consider the Lie group SU_3 acting on $\mathbb{C}^3$ and its sub-group $G \subset SU_3$ preserving the T^2-cone $C \subset \mathbb{C}^3$. We denote by $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{su}_3$ the Lie algebras of $G \subset SU_3$ respectively. We put

$$\mathcal{B} := \mathbb{C}^3 \oplus (\mathfrak{su}_3/\mathfrak{g}) \tag{10.4}$$

which is a finite-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ (not over $\mathbb{C}$ as C is not a complex variety).

The deformation of $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ will be parametrized by $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and a a C^1-small closed 1-form on $T^*\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ decaying with rate > 2 at the unique singular point $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}_\epsilon$.

We first define a smooth embedding $\xi_a : \Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x) \to \widetilde{N}$. We therefore need a Weinstein neighbourhood of $X' \equiv X \setminus \{x\}$ in (N, ω) similar to that of Y' in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta})$. We can take indeed a neighbourhood U_X of X' in T^*X' (where X' is identified with the zero-section of T^*X'), a neighbourhood V_X of X' in N and a diffeomorphism $\Phi_X : U_X \to V_X$ satisfying the following three properties: (i) Φ_X restricted to X' is the identity map; (ii) $\Phi_X^*\omega$ is the canonical symplectic form on $U_X \subset T^*X'$; (iii) Φ_X restricted to the fibres over $X' \cap V_x$ may be identified with $\Phi_K : U_K \to V_K$ under the diffeomorphism $\Phi_x \circ \Phi_K \circ df : K \cap U'_x \to X' \cap V_x$ (in the notation of Definition 2.6). We can then define

$$\xi_a := \Pi_N^{-1} \circ \Phi_X \circ \Pi_{N*} a. \tag{10.5}$$

We also define a smooth embedding $\eta_{\epsilon;a,b} : Y^\epsilon \to \widetilde{N}$. We shall translate and rotate by $b \in \mathcal{B}$ the singular point $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ in $\widetilde{N}$ and therefore need some preparation. We denote by $\mathcal{E}$ the principal SU_3-bundle over $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ whose fibre over $y' \in \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ consists of all $\mathbb{C}$-linear isomorphisms $e : T_y\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \to T_{y'}\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ with

$$e^*\tilde{\theta}|_{y'} = \tilde{\theta}|_y,\ e^*\widetilde{\Theta}|_{y'} = \widetilde{\Theta}|_y. \tag{10.6}$$

We denote by 1_y the identity map of $T_y\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$, which lies in the fibre of $\mathcal{E}$ over y. We can then find a neighbourhood of $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathbf{0}$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and an embedding $E : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{E}$ with $E(\mathbf{0}) = 1_y$ and $E(\mathcal{D})$ transverse to the G-orbit of 1_y in $\mathcal{E}$.

By Darboux's theorem and elementary techniques we can also find Hamilton diffeomorphisms Φ_b of $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2},\tilde{\theta})$ parametrized by $b\in\mathcal{D}$ (where we make $\mathcal{D}$ smaller if necessary) with the following two properties:

(i) Φ_b is the identity map outside a neighbourhood of y in $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$;

(ii) $d\Phi_b|_y = E(b)$ as an element of the fibre of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\Phi_b(y)$.

The smooth embedding $\eta_{\epsilon;a,b}:Y^\epsilon\to\widetilde{N}$ is then defined by

$$\eta_{\epsilon;a,b} := \widetilde{\Psi}\circ\Delta_\epsilon^*\circ\Phi_b\circ\Phi_Y\circ(\eta_\epsilon^* a+\alpha_\epsilon). \tag{10.7}$$

This map may be glued together with (10.5) into a smooth embedding of $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ into $\widetilde{N}$. We denote it by $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b}:\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon\to\widetilde{N}$.

The remaining sections will be devoted to finding such a,b that makes $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b}$ special Lagrangian with respect to $(\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon,\widetilde{\Omega})$. Clearly $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b}$ is Lagrangian with respect to $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$, and for $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b}$ to be *special* it suffices that $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b}^*\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}=0$. We shall solve it in some Banach spaces and shall therefore make a careful choice of norms, which we do in the next section.

11 Choice of Norms

As $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ is a *non-compact* manifold we shall use some *weighted* norms over $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ so that we can use a well-known Fredholm theory established by Lockhart–McOwen [23] et al. in general and used by Joyce [17] et al. in special Lagrangian geometry.

One minor remark is that we use weighted *Hölder* norms whereas Lockhart–McOwen, Joyce et al. use weighted *Sobolev* norms. Sobolev norms are more useful for the linear theory but Hölder norms are more useful for a non-linear analysis (in §14 below). One reference for the Hölder version is Marshall [24].

More importantly we shall use (a Hölder version of) Pacini's (weighted Sobolev) norms [27]. Any norms over $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ will clearly depend on ϵ but we shall have to study *how* they depend and Pacini's norms will be suitable for that purpose.

We begin now with radius functions on various spaces. As in §2 we define $r:K'\to\mathbb{R}_+$ as the Euclidean distance from $\mathbf{0}\in K\subset\mathbb{C}^4$.

The radius function on the compact special Lagrangian K-fold $X\subset N$ is an $\mathbb{R}_+$-valued smooth function ρ_X on $X'\equiv X\setminus\{x\}$ such that in the notation of §8 we have

$$\rho_X\circ\Phi_x\circ\Phi_K\circ df = r \text{ on } K'\cap U_x. \tag{11.1}$$

It is of course non-unique, but any choice will do.

The radius function on the non-compact special Lagrangian C-fold $Y\subset\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ is an $\mathbb{R}_+$-valued smooth function ρ_Y on $Y':=Y\setminus\{y\}$ satisfying the following two properties:

(i) $\rho_Y = r\circ\Pi_Q$ on $Y\setminus\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4)=\Pi_Q^{-1}(K\setminus B_4)$;

(ii) near y the function ρ_Y is the distance from y with respect to the Kähler metric associated to $\tilde{\theta}$ on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$.

It is also non-unique, but any choice will do as well.

The radius function on $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ is a unique smooth function $\rho_\epsilon : \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\Pi_{N*}\rho_\epsilon = \rho_X \text{ on } X \setminus V_x \text{ and } \eta_\epsilon^*\rho_\epsilon = \epsilon\rho_Y \text{ on } Y^\epsilon \tag{11.2}$$

in the notation of §10.

Now we define two Riemannian metrics on $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$. We denote by g_ϵ the Riemannian metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ induced from the Kähler form $\widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon$ on $\widetilde{N}$. We call g_ϵ the *conical* metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$, and $\rho_\epsilon^{-2}g_\epsilon$ the *cylindrical* metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$.

Given a real number $\beta \in (0,1)$, a non-negative integer k and a Riemannian metric on a manifold M one can define (unweighted) Hölder $C^{k,\beta}$-norms over M in the standard manner. We denote by $C^{k,\beta}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$ the unweighted Hölder spaces with respect to the *cylindrical* metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$.

The *weighted* Hölder spaces $C^{k,\beta}_\mu(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, may be defined as follows: we choose an ϵ-dependent smooth function $w_{\epsilon;\mu} : \widetilde{X}_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\eta_\epsilon^* w_{\epsilon;\mu} = (\rho_Y)^\mu$ near y; then $C^{k,\beta}_\mu(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$ is the set of those $f \in C^{k,\beta}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\|w_{\epsilon;\mu}^{-1}f\|_{C^{k,\beta}} < \infty \tag{11.3}$$

where $\| \bullet \|_{C^{k,\beta}}$ denotes the *unweighted* $C^{k,\beta}$-norm.

The choice of the weight function $w_{\epsilon;\mu}$ does not matter for ϵ fixed, but does matter in treating all ϵ simultaneously (as in Theorem 13.5 below). We therefore use the weight function of Pacini [27].

We take $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ and an ϵ-*independent* smooth function $w_{\mu,\nu} : Y' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying the following two properties:

(i) $w_{\mu,\nu} = r^\nu \circ \Pi_Q$ on $Y \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4) = \Pi_Q^{-1}(K \setminus B_4)$;

(ii) $w_{\mu,\nu} = (\rho_Y)^\mu$ near y.

It is of course non-unique, but any choice will do. We can then define a unique smooth function $w_{\epsilon;\mu,\nu} : \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\Pi_{N*}w_{\epsilon;\mu,\nu} = (\rho_X)^\nu \text{ on } X \setminus V_x \text{ and } \eta_\epsilon^* w_{\epsilon;\mu,\nu} = \epsilon^\nu w_{\mu,\nu} \text{ on } Y^\epsilon. \tag{11.4}$$

Having chosen the weight function $w_{\epsilon;\mu,\nu}$ we can define a weighted Hölder norm $\| \bullet \|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}}$ over $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ by setting

$$\|f\|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} := \|w_{\epsilon;\mu,\nu}^{-1}f\|_{C^{k,\beta}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} < \infty \text{ for } f \in C^{k,\beta}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R}). \tag{11.5}$$

We have treated only $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ but the material above readily extends to tensor fields on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$.

We also define weighted Hölder spaces over X', Y' as well as over $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$. We denote by g_X, g_Y the Riemannian metrics on X', Y' induced from the Kähler

forms $\omega, \tilde{\theta}$ on $N, \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ respectively. We call g_X, g_Y the conical metrics on X', Y' respectively, and $\rho_X^{-2} g_X, \rho_Y^{-2} g_Y$ the cylindrical metrics on X', Y' with respectively. We define the unweighted Hölder norms over X', Y' with respect to the cylindrical metrics respectively. We also define weighted Hölder norms

$$\|f_X\|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\nu}(X')} := \|\rho_X^{-\nu} f_X\|_{C^{k,\beta}(X')}, \tag{11.6}$$

$$\|f_Y\|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y')} := \|w_{\mu,\nu}^{-1} f_Y\|_{C^{k,\beta}(Y')} \tag{11.7}$$

where f_X, f_Y are $C^{k,\beta}$-functions or tensor fields on X', Y' respectively.

Now we compare (11.5) with (11.6)–(11.7). Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we write $x \approx y$ if $c^{-1} y \leqslant x \leqslant cy$ for some constant $c > 0$ independent of ϵ. We also use the following notation: given $A \subset \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ for instance we denote by $\| \bullet \|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(A)}$ the $C^{k,\beta}$-norm over A (defined as a supremum over A instead of over $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$); we use the similar notation for subsets of X', Y'. We have then

$$\|f\|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \approx \|\Pi_{N*} f\|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu}(X \setminus V_x)} + \epsilon^{-\nu} \|\eta_\epsilon^* f\|_{C^{k,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y^\epsilon)} \tag{11.8}$$

for f an arbitrary $C^{k,\beta}$-function or tensor field on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$.

The material of the next section will be used only in §14.3 below but is closely related to the weighted Hölder spaces above and so included here.

12 Some Linear Analysis

We define a smooth function $w_X : X' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by setting $(w_X)^2 \omega^{\wedge 3} = -(i/2)^3 \Omega \wedge \overline{\Omega}$ pointwise on $X' \subset N'$. One easily sees that w_X has rate -1 so that $w_X \in C^\infty_{-1}(X') := \bigcap_{k \geqslant 0} C^{k,\beta}_{-1}(X')$ which is clearly independent of $\beta \in (0,1)$.

For each $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ we define a linear elliptic operator

$$P_\nu : C^{2,\beta}_\nu(X'; \mathbb{R}) \to C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X'; \mathbb{R}) \tag{12.1}$$

by setting $P_\nu u := w_X^{-1} d_X^* (w_X du)$ where d_X^* denotes the formal adjoint to d with respect to the *conical* metric on X' (in the terminology above).

We have then:

Lemma 12.1. *For $\nu < 0$ close enough to 0 the operator P_ν is surjective and its kernel consists of locally-constant functions.*

Remark 12.2. The operator P_ν is similar to $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ (treated in §§13–14) and $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ is already studied in detail by Joyce [17]; but there is a little difference between the two operators and there seem no such quick references for P_ν. We therefore give a rather detailed proof of Lemma 12.1 though the necessary techniques are all standard.

Proof of Lemma 12.1. An elementary computation shows that near the singular point $x \in X$ the operator P_ν is asymptotically of the form

$$f r^{-2} (-(r \tfrac{\partial}{\partial r})^2 + Q) \tag{12.2}$$

where $f \in C_0^\infty(K';\mathbb{R}_+)$, r denotes the radius function on $K' \cong \mathbb{R}_+ \times T^2$ and Q denotes a linear elliptic operator $C^\infty(T^2;\mathbb{R}) \to C^\infty(T^2;\mathbb{R})$ which is not self-adjoint (with respect to the flat metric on T^2) but the eigenvalues of which are all real and contains 0.

Making $\nu < 0$ closer to 0 if necessary we may suppose that ν^2 is not an eigenvalue of P. The Lockhart–McOwen type Fredholm theory then immediately implies that (12.1) is a Fredholm operator and that its co-kernel is dual to the kernel of its formal adjoint (with respect to the conical metric on X') i.e. the operator

$$P_\nu^* : C^{2,\beta}_{-1-\nu}(X';\mathbb{R}) \to C^{0,\beta}_{-3-\nu}(X';\mathbb{R}) \tag{12.3}$$

given by $u \mapsto d_X^* w_X d(w_X^{-1} u)$.

Now we prove that P_ν is surjective, which is equivalent to $\operatorname{Ker} P_\nu^* = 0$. If $u \in \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu^*$ then an integration-by-parts applied to $w_X^{-1} u\, P_\nu^* u$ shows that $u = 0$ as we want; the rate of u is large enough to do the integration-by-parts.

We then prove that $\operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ consists of locally-constant functions. Clearly if $u \in \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ then u is constant on any connected component of X not containing the singular point of X. We may therefore suppose X connected and we have then only to prove $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu = 1$.

This is not so easy as the proof of surjectivity above; the rate of $u \in \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ is too small to do an integration-by-parts. We give two proofs of $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu = 1$, both using the fact that Q has only real eigenvalues:

First Proof. One approach is given by Lockhart–McOwen's formula [23, (0.10)]: for $\nu' > 0$ close enough to 0 we have

$$\operatorname{Ind} P_\nu - \operatorname{Ind} P_{\nu'} = N(\nu, \nu') \tag{12.4}$$

where $\operatorname{Ind} P_\nu, \operatorname{Ind} P_{\nu'}$ denote the Fredholm indices of $P_\nu, P_{\nu'}$ respectively and $N(\nu,\nu')$ is given by Lockhart–McOwen [23, (0,10)] and may be computed as follows. Since the eigenvalues of Q are all real it follows that $N(\nu,\nu')$ is the (real) dimension of the vector space of all polynomials p in $\log r$ with co-efficients in $C^\infty(T^2;\mathbb{R})$ such that $\big((-r\frac{\partial}{\partial r})^2 + Q\big)p = 0$. We then immediately find that p is of the form $c_0 + c_1 \log r$ for some $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $N(\nu,\nu') = 2$.

On the other hand $\operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ clearly contains constant functions so that $\operatorname{Ind} P_\nu \geqslant 1 - 0$. The integration-by-parts technique also implies $\operatorname{Ker} P_{\nu'} = 0$ whereas $\operatorname{Ker} P_{\nu'}^*$ has constant functions so that $\operatorname{Ind} P_{\nu'} \leqslant 0 - 1$. Consequently $\operatorname{Ind} P_\nu - \operatorname{Ind} P_{\nu'} \geqslant 2 = N(\nu,\nu')$ which implies that $\operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ consists only of constant functions. This completes the proof that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu = 1$. □

Second Proof. One can also determine $\operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ more directly. A standard argument (similar to the proof of [13, Theorem 6]) shows that if $u \in \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$ then near x in X' we may write $u = u' + v$ for some u' with rate > 0 and some v of rate 0 with $\big((-r\frac{\partial}{\partial r})^2 + Q\big)v = 0$. The separation-of-variable technique over $K' \cong \mathbb{R}_+ \times T^2$ then implies that $v = \sum v_\lambda r^\lambda$ for some $v_\lambda \in C^\infty(T^2;\mathbb{R})$ where λ runs over the set

$$\Lambda := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}\lambda = 0 \text{ and } \lambda^2 \text{ is an eigenvalue of } Q\}.$$

However Q has only real eigenvalues so that $\Lambda = \{0\}$. We then immediately find that v_0 is constant so that $u' \in \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu$. The rate of u' is now large enough to apply the integration-by-parts to $u' w_X P_\nu u'$ to find that $u' = 0$, which completes the proof that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Ker} P_\nu = 1$. □

This completes the proof of Lemma 12.1. □

13 How to Solve $\xi^*_{\epsilon;a,b} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} = 0$

As we have seen at the end of §10 we have to solve the equation $\xi^*_{\epsilon;a,b} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} = 0$. This section will explain how to do it.

We shall re-write the equation $\xi^*_{\epsilon;a,b} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} = 0$ into a more convenient form and we therefore need the following notation:

- We fix the Hölder exponent $\beta \in (0,1)$. We also fix $\mu > 2$ close enough to 2 as in Theorem 13.3 below, and $\nu < 0$ close enough to 0 as in Lemma 12.1 above.

- We denote by $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ the set of all *exact* 1-forms on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ of class $C^{1,\beta}_\mu$ and give $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ the $C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}$-norm in the notation of §11. One easily sees that $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ is a Banach space with respect to the $C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}$-norm.

- We fix an ϵ-independent norm $|\bullet|$ on $\mathcal{B}$. It is of course non-unique, but any choice will do. We define a norm $\|\bullet\|_\epsilon$ on $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B}$ by setting

$$\|(a,b)\|_\epsilon := \|a\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} + \epsilon^{-\nu+2}|b|. \tag{13.1}$$

- We fix a real number $\lambda \in (2-\nu, 3)$ and define a closed neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ of $\mathbf{0}$ in $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B}$ by setting

$$\mathcal{U}_\epsilon := \{(a,b) \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B} : \|(a,b)\|_\epsilon \leqslant \epsilon^\lambda\}. \tag{13.2}$$

  Making ϵ smaller if necessary we may suppose that for each $(a,b) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ the 1-form a is C^1-small enough for $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b} : \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \to \widetilde{N}$ to be well-defined as in §10 but as a $C^{1,\beta}$-*differentiable* map (rather than a C^∞-differentiable map) because a is only $C^{1,\beta}$-differentiable.
  A well-known regularity result of course shows that if $\xi^*_{\epsilon;a,b} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} = 0$ then $\xi_{\epsilon;a,b}$ is C^∞-differentiable as it defines an area-minimizing submanifold of $\widetilde{N}$ (with respect to a suitable metric).

- We define a smooth function $w_\epsilon : \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by setting $w_\epsilon^2 \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon^{\wedge 3} = -(i/2)^3 \widetilde{\Omega} \wedge \overline{\widetilde{\Omega}}$ pointwise on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \subset \widetilde{N}$. We denote by dV_ϵ the volume 3-form on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ with respect to the conical metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ (in the terminology of §11). We introduce a functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(a,b) := \xi^*_{\epsilon;a,b} \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} / w_\epsilon dV_\epsilon, \ (a,b) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon. \tag{13.3}$$

A straight-forward computation (similar to [18, §6.1]) shows that $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ maps $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ into $C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$.

Now we have only to solve the equation $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(a,b)=0$ in $(a,b)\in\mathcal{U}_\epsilon$. We begin with an idea of McLean [25]. We define a closed linear subspace $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon\subset C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$ of (real) co-dimension 1 by setting

$$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon:=\{f\in C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R}):\textstyle\int_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon} w_\epsilon f dV_\epsilon=0\}. \tag{13.4}$$

McLean's idea may then be formulated as follows:

Lemma 13.1. $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathcal{U}_\epsilon)\subset\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$.

Remark 13.2. This is tricky in that the map $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon:\mathcal{U}_\epsilon\to C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$ is *non-linear* but its image is contained in the *linear* subspace $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$ of $C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon;\mathbb{R})$.

Proof of Lemma 13.1. For each $u\in\mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ we have

$$\int_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon} w_\epsilon\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u)dV_\epsilon=\int_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon}\xi^*_{\epsilon;u}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}=\bigl[\widetilde{X}_\epsilon\bigr]\cdot\bigl[\xi^*_{\epsilon;u}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}\bigr]=\bigl[\widetilde{X}_\epsilon\bigr]\cdot\bigl[\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}\bigr]=\int_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega} \tag{13.5}$$

where the homology class $\bigl[\widetilde{X}_\epsilon\bigr]\in H_3(\widetilde{N};\mathbb{R})$ is *independent* of ϵ by the construction of $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$. The construction of $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ also implies that $\int_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}$ tends to $\int_X\operatorname{Im}\Omega$ as $\epsilon\to+0$, which vanishes because X is special Lagrangian in (N,ω,Ω). Consequently we have $\int_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}=0$, which combined with (13.5) completes the proof of Lemma 13.1. □

We then consider the linearized operator of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(a,b)$ at $(a,b)=(0,0)$. Pointwise on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ we may write $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(a,b)=\mathrm{F}_\epsilon(a,\nabla a,b)$ where F_ϵ is a smooth function and ∇a denotes the (covariant) derivative (with respect to the conical metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ for instance). We define $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b)$ as the differential of $\mathrm{F}_\epsilon(a,\nabla a,b)$ at $(0,0,0)$. Since $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathcal{U}_\epsilon)\subset\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$ we immediately find $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\oplus\mathcal{B})\subset\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$.

To give an explicit expression of $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ we recall and introduce some notation. At the end of §10 we have taken Hamilton diffeomorphisms Φ_b of $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus2},\tilde{\theta})$ parametrized by $b\in\mathcal{B}$, to which we can associate uniquely a compactly-supported Hamiltonian $H_b:\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus2}\to\mathbb{R}$. We put $H'_b:=\lim_{t\to0}H_{tb}/t$ where the convergence is pointwise on $\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus2}$.

For $(a,b)\in\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\oplus\mathcal{B}$ we define an exact 1-form $u_{a,b}$ on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ by setting

$$u_{a,b}:=a+d(\epsilon^2\eta_{\epsilon*}H'_b|_{Y'}) \tag{13.6}$$

where the push-forward $\eta_{\epsilon*}H'_b|_{Y'}$ is well-defined as H'_b is supported near y. A well-known computation then shows

$$\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b)=-w_\epsilon^{-1}d^*_\epsilon(w_\epsilon\cos\phi_\epsilon u_{a,b}) \tag{13.7}$$

where d^*_ϵ denotes the formal adjoint to d with respect to the conical metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$, and ϕ_ϵ denotes the $(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$-valued smooth function on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ characterized by $\widetilde{\Omega}|_{\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon}=e^{i\phi_\epsilon}dV_\epsilon$.

The following theorem is a version of Joyce's result [18, Definition 6.8] concerning the fact that the T^2-cone C is stable in his sense:

Theorem 13.3. *$\mathcal{L}_\epsilon : \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{V}_\epsilon$ is a linear isomorphism for $\mu > 2$ close enough to 2.*

Remark 13.4. The injectivity may be proven as follows: if $(a, b) \in \operatorname{Ker} \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ then we write $a = df$ and apply an integration-by-parts to

$$(f + \eta_{\epsilon *} H'_b|_{Y'})\, d^*\big(w_\epsilon \cos\phi_\epsilon d(f + \epsilon^2 \eta_{\epsilon *} H'_b|_{Y'})\big) = 0 \tag{13.8}$$

to find that $d(f + \epsilon^2 \eta_{\epsilon *} H'_b|_{Y'}) = 0$, which readily implies $(a, b) = (0, 0)$.

The proof of surjectivity is not so easy. The Lockhart–McOwen type Fredholm theory implies (for μ close enough to 2) an explicit expression of the co-kernel of the map $C^{2,\beta}_\mu(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon; \mathbb{R}) \to C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon; \mathbb{R})$ given by $u \mapsto d^*_\epsilon(w_\epsilon \cos\phi_\epsilon du)$. Joyce [18, Definition 6.8] proves that it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}$, which is elementary but crucial to Theorem 13.3.

By Theorem 13.3 we can apply Inverse Function Theorem to $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon : \mathcal{U}_\epsilon \to \mathcal{V}_\epsilon$ but the range where $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ is invertible may be too small to contain $0 \in \mathcal{V}_\epsilon$, which does not solve the equation $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(a, b) = 0$. We shall therefore 'estimate' the invertibility of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$. As in (11.8) we write $x \lesssim y$ if $x \leqslant cy$ for some $c > 0$ independent of ϵ. We have then:

Theorem 13.5. *The following three statements hold for ϵ small enough:*

(i) $\|\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \lesssim \epsilon^{\lambda-\nu}$;

(ii) *the quadratic operator $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon := \mathcal{F}_\epsilon - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0}) - \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ satisfies the estimate*

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_1) - \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_0)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \lesssim \epsilon^{\nu-2}\|u_1 - u_0\|_\epsilon(\|u_1\|_\epsilon + \|u_0\|_\epsilon);$$

(iii) *$\mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ is ϵ-uniformly invertible so that $\|(a, b)\|_\epsilon \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a, b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)}$.*

These three estimates imply:

Corollary 13.6. *For ϵ small enough there exists $u = (a, b) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ with $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(a, b) = 0$.*

Proof. We define a map $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon : \mathcal{U}_\epsilon \to \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B}$ by setting

$$\mathcal{G}_\epsilon := -\mathcal{L}_\epsilon^{-1}\big(\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0}) + \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon\big). \tag{13.9}$$

The equation $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u) = 0$ is then equivalent to $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u) = u$ and we therefore use Banach's fixed-point theorem.

We first prove that $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(\mathcal{U}_\epsilon) \subset \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$. By Theorem 13.5 (i)–(iii) there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent of $\epsilon > 0$ such that for $u \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u)\|_\epsilon \leqslant c\epsilon^{\lambda-\nu} + c\epsilon^{2\lambda+\nu-2}. \tag{13.10}$$

Making ϵ smaller if necessary we may suppose $c\epsilon^{-\nu} < 1/100$, $c\epsilon^{\lambda+\nu-2} < 1/100$ because $\nu > 0$, $\lambda + \nu - 2 > 0$ respectively. We then find from (13.10) that $\|\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u)\|_\epsilon \leqslant \epsilon^\lambda$ i.e. $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ as we want.

It suffices now to prove that the map $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon : \mathcal{U}_\epsilon \to \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ is a contraction mapping. If $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ then by Theorem 13.5 (ii)–(iii) there exists a constant $c' > 0$ independent of ϵ with

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u)-\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(u')\|_\epsilon \leqslant c'\epsilon^{\nu-2}(\|u\|_\epsilon+\|u'\|_\epsilon)\|u-u'\|_\epsilon \leqslant 2c'\epsilon^{\lambda+\nu-2}\|u-u'\|_\epsilon. \quad (13.11)$$

Since $\lambda+\nu-2 > 0$ it follows that making ϵ smaller if necessary we may suppose $2c'\epsilon^{\lambda+\nu-2} < \frac{1}{100}$. We then find from (13.11) that $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$ is a contraction mapping, which completes the proof of Corollary 13.6. □

We turn now to the proof of Theorem 13.5, which will occupy the whole of the next section.

14 Proof of Theorem 13.5

Theorem 13.5 consists of the three estimates (i)–(iii) and we shall prove them in §§14.1–14.3 below respectively.

14.1 Proof of Theorem 13.5 (i)

Theorem 13.5 (i) claims a $C^{0,\beta}$-estimate but we prove indeed a stronger C^k-estimate

$$\|\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\lambda-\nu} \quad (14.1)$$

for each integer $k \geqslant 0$. We do it for two purposes:

- we use (14.1) with $k = 2$, in the proof of Theorem 13.5 (iii) below;
- things will be presented more naturally by dealing with the general C^k-estimate.

We first recall from (10.3) that $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon = \Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x) \cup \eta_\epsilon(Y^\epsilon)$ and that $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon \setminus \eta_\epsilon(Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))$ is special Lagrangian in $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\Omega})$ so that

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})|_{\widetilde{X}_\epsilon \setminus \eta_\epsilon(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} = 0. \quad (14.2)$$

Hence by (11.8) we get

$$\|\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \approx \epsilon^{-\nu+2}\|\eta_\epsilon^*\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \quad (14.3)$$

Consequently (14.1), the estimate we want, is equivalent to

$$\|\eta_\epsilon^*\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim \epsilon^{\lambda-2}. \quad (14.4)$$

We then recall from (13.3) that we have $\eta_\epsilon^*\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0}) = \eta_\epsilon^* \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Omega}/\eta_\epsilon^*(w_\epsilon dV_\epsilon)$. We denote by dV_Y the volume 3-form on Y' with respect to the conical metric (in

the terminology of §11). We define a smooth function $w_Y : Y' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by setting $(w_Y)^2\tilde{\theta}^{\wedge 3} = -(i/2)^3\widetilde{\Theta}\wedge\overline{\widetilde{\Theta}}$ pointwise on $Y' \subset \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$. We also recall from Lemma 8.1 (i) that there exists a smooth function $c : \widetilde{U}_x \to \mathbb{C}$ with $c|_{\mathbb{CP}^1} = 1$ and $\widetilde{\Psi}_x^*\widetilde{\Omega} = c\,\widetilde{\Theta}$.

A straight-forward computation using (10.2) and Lemma 8.1 (ii) shows that there exists a smooth function $G_\epsilon : Y'\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\|G_\epsilon\|_{C^k(Y'\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim 1$ (an *unweighted* estimate) and

$$\eta_\epsilon^*\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0}) = G_\epsilon\alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*\operatorname{Im}(\Delta_\epsilon^* c)\widetilde{\Theta}/w_Y dV_Y. \tag{14.5}$$

Hence by the general inequality $\|ab\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}} \lesssim \|a\|_{C^k}\|b\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}}$ we get

$$\|\eta_\epsilon^*\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0})\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim \|\alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*\operatorname{Im}(\Delta_\epsilon^* c)\widetilde{\Theta}/w_Y dV_Y\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))}. \tag{14.6}$$

Now we prove:

$$\|\alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Theta}/w_Y dV_Y\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y'\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim \epsilon^{\lambda-2}, \tag{14.7}$$

$$\|\alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*\operatorname{Im}(\Delta_\epsilon^* c - 1)\widetilde{\Theta}/w_Y dV_Y\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y'\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim \epsilon < \epsilon^{\lambda-2}. \tag{14.8}$$

Proof of (14.7). We introduce a functional $\mathcal{G}(\alpha_\epsilon) := \alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{\Theta}/w_Y dV_Y$. Recall that α_ϵ is supported in $Y\setminus\Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})$, where the weight function involved in the $C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}$-norm is equivalent to a constant so that

$$\|\mathcal{G}(\alpha_\epsilon)\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y'\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \approx \|\mathcal{G}(\alpha_\epsilon)\|_{C^k(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5\setminus\overline{B_4}))}. \tag{14.9}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{G}(\alpha_\epsilon)$ is pointwise on $Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5\setminus\overline{B_4})$ a smooth function of α_ϵ and its (covariant) derivative $\nabla\alpha_\epsilon$ (with respect to the conical metric on Y' for instance). Notice also that $\mathcal{G}(0) = 0$ as Y is special Lagrangian in $(\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\oplus 2}, \tilde{\theta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$. We then find, using Taylor's theorem, that

$$\|\mathcal{G}(\alpha_\epsilon)\|_{C^k(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5\setminus\overline{B_4}))} \lesssim \|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{C^k(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5\setminus\overline{B_4}))} + \|\nabla\alpha_\epsilon\|_{C^k(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5\setminus\overline{B_4}))}. \tag{14.10}$$

On the other hand by the definition of α_ϵ we have

$$\|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{C^{k+1}(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5\setminus\overline{B_4}))} \lesssim \epsilon^{\lambda-2} \tag{14.11}$$

whence by (14.10) we get (14.7). □

Proof of (14.8). A straight-forward computation shows

$$\|\alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*\widetilde{\Theta}/w_Y dV_Y\|_{C^k(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim 1. \tag{14.12}$$

On the other hand since $c|_{\mathbb{CP}^1} \equiv 1$ we find, considering the effect of the dilation Δ_ϵ, that

$$\|\alpha_\epsilon^*\Phi_Y^*(\Delta_\epsilon^* c - 1)\|_{C^k_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5))} \lesssim \epsilon. \tag{14.13}$$

Multiplying (14.12)–(14.13) and taking the imaginary part of $(\Delta_\epsilon^* c - 1)\widetilde{\Theta}$ we get the first inequality of (14.8).

We may of course suppose $\epsilon < 1$ so that $\epsilon < \epsilon^{\lambda-2}$ as $\lambda < 3$, which completes the proof of (14.8). □

From (14.6)–(14.8) we get (14.4), completing the proof of Theorem 13.5 (i).

14.2 Proof of Theorem 13.5 (ii)

One easily sees that the quadratic operator $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon := \mathcal{F}_\epsilon - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathbf{0}) - \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ satisfies an estimate of the form

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_1) - \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_0)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \lesssim c_\epsilon \|u_1 - u_0\|_\epsilon (\|u_1\|_\epsilon + \|u_0\|_\epsilon) \tag{14.14}$$

where $u_0, u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ are arbitrary and $c_\epsilon > 0$ denotes an ϵ-dependent constant. Theorem 13.5 (ii) claims that we may take $c_\epsilon = \epsilon^{\nu-2}$.

Recall from (8.1) that $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ is the union of three kinds of regions $\Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x)$, $\widetilde{\Psi}_x\big(\Pi_Q^{-1}\Phi_K(\operatorname{Graph} df_\epsilon)\big)$ and $\eta_\epsilon(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4}))$. We may treat them individually as the claim is a pointwise estimate. We therefore proceed in three steps.

First Step

We begin with $\Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x)$ which is independent of ϵ. The weight functions involved in the norms in (14.14) are, on $\Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x)$, equivalent to constants. Notice also that $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a,b)|_{\Pi_N^{-1}(X\setminus V_x)}$ is independent of ϵ as a function of $a|_{\Pi_N^{-1}(X\setminus V_x)}$. These imply that on $\Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x)$ the estimate (14.14) holds with $c_\epsilon = 1 > \epsilon^{\nu-2}$ for $\epsilon < 1$.

Second Step

We then consider the region $\widetilde{\Psi}_x\Pi_Q^{-1}\Phi_K(\operatorname{Graph} df_\epsilon)$ which depends on ϵ now. We shall transfer things on $\widetilde{\Psi}_x\Pi_Q^{-1}\Phi_K(\operatorname{Graph} df_\epsilon)$ to an *ϵ-independent* region and we therefore need some preparation.

Making U_x smaller if necessary we may suppose $U_x = B_d$ for some $d > 0$. Making ϵ also smaller if necessary we may suppose $8\epsilon < d$ so that for each $p \in K' \cap U_x \setminus B_{4\epsilon}$ we can take a real number r with $4\epsilon < r < 2r < d$ and $p \in K \cap B_{2r} \setminus \overline{B_r}$. We fix such p and r.

As $K \subset \mathbb{C}^4$ we can define a dilation map $\mathrm{D}_r : K \to K$ by $\boldsymbol{z} \mapsto r\boldsymbol{z}$ so that $\mathrm{D}_r^{-1}(p) \in K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$. We put $\alpha_{r,\epsilon} := r^{-2}\mathrm{D}_r^*(df_\epsilon|_{K\cap B_{2r}\setminus\overline{B_r}})$ which is a 1-form on $K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$. We define a smooth embedding $\gamma_{r,\epsilon} : K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1} \to \widetilde{\Psi}_x\Pi_Q^{-1}\Phi_K(\operatorname{Graph} df_\epsilon)$ by

$$\gamma_{r,\epsilon} := \widetilde{\Psi}_x \circ \Pi_Q^{-1} \circ \Phi_K \circ \alpha_{r,\epsilon}.$$

We can then pull back things on $\widetilde{\Psi}_x\Pi_Q^{-1}\Phi_K(\operatorname{Graph} df_\epsilon)$ under $\gamma_{r,\epsilon}$ and work over the ϵ-independent region $K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$.

For α a 1-form on $K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$ we define

$$\mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon}(\alpha) := (\alpha + \alpha_{r,\epsilon})^* \mathrm{D}_r^* \Phi_K^* \Pi_{Q*} \widetilde{\Psi}_x^* \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} / \gamma_{r,\epsilon}^*(w_\epsilon dV_\epsilon) \tag{14.15}$$

so that for $u = (a, b) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ we have $\gamma_{r,\epsilon}^* \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u) = \mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon}(r^{-2}\gamma_{r,\epsilon}^* a)$. As an analogue to $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon$ we define a quadratic operator $\mathcal{Q}_{r,\epsilon} := \mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon} - \mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon}(\alpha_{r,\epsilon}) - \mathcal{L}_{r,\epsilon}$ (where $\mathcal{L}_{r,\epsilon}$ linearizes $\mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon}$ at $\alpha_{r,\epsilon}$ pointwise on $K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$) so that

$$\gamma_{r,\epsilon}^* \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u) = \mathcal{Q}_{r,\epsilon}(r^{-2}\gamma_{r,\epsilon}^* a). \tag{14.16}$$

On the other hand the definition of weight functions implies that for $a \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ we have

$$\|r^{-2}\gamma_{\epsilon,r}^* a\|_{C^{1,\beta}(K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1})} \approx r^{\nu-2} \|a\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(\gamma_{r,\epsilon}(K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}))} \leqslant r^{\nu-2} \|(a,0)\|_\epsilon \tag{14.17}$$

and that if $u_0, u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ and if we put $f = \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_1) - \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_0)$ then

$$\|f\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\gamma_{r,\epsilon}(K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}))} \approx r^{-\nu+2} \|\gamma_{r,\epsilon}^* f\|_{C^{0,\beta}(K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1})}. \tag{14.18}$$

Now we prove that if α_0, α_1 are 1-forms on $X \setminus V_x$ then

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_{r,\epsilon}(\alpha_1) - \mathcal{Q}_{r,\epsilon}(\alpha_0)\|_{C^{0,\beta}} \lesssim \|\alpha_1 - \alpha_0\|_{C^{1,\beta}} (\|\alpha_1\|_{C^{1,\beta}} + \|\alpha_0\|_{C^{1,\beta}}) \tag{14.19}$$

where the $C^{0,\beta}$-norm and the $C^{1,\beta}$-norms are unweighted and taken over $K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1}$. A straight-forward computation that (14.19) holds up to a constant dependent on r or ϵ.

To eliminate that constant we express $\mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon}$ in a more convenient form (similar to (14.5) in §14.1 above). We define a smooth function $w_K : K' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by setting $(w_K)^2 \theta^{\wedge 3} = -(i/2)^2 \Theta \wedge \overline{\Theta}$ pointwise on $K' \subset Q'$. We denote by dV_K the volume 3-form on K' induced from the Kähler form θ on Q'. We may then write

$$\mathcal{F}_{r,\epsilon}(\alpha) = G_{r,\epsilon}(\alpha + \alpha_{r,\epsilon})^* \Phi_K^* \operatorname{Im} \Theta / w_K dV_K \tag{14.20}$$

for some smooth functions $G_{r,\epsilon} : K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $F_r : B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1} \to \mathbb{C}$ with $\|G_{r,\epsilon}\|_{C^{100}(K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1})} + \|F_r\|_{C^{100}(B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1})} \lesssim 1$. This readily implies that (14.19) holds as it is.

Combining (14.16)–(14.19) we find that (14.14) holds with $c_\epsilon = r^{\nu-2} \lesssim \epsilon^{\nu-2}$ over $\gamma_{\epsilon,r}(K \cap B_2 \setminus \overline{B_1})$ and so over $\widetilde{\Psi}_x \Pi_Q^{-1} \Phi_K(\operatorname{Graph} df_\epsilon)$ as we want.

Third Step

It remains to consider the region $\eta_\epsilon(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4}))$. This also depends on ϵ but is simpler in that we are already given the map η_ϵ which transfers things to the ϵ-independent region $Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_4)$.

On the other hand $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a, b)$ does depend on b now (which did not over the first and second regions) and we are concerned moreover with the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a, b)$ at the singular point of Y; but these are rather irrelevant to ϵ and so will play only a minor rôle in our treatment.

We first proceed as in the second step. For $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and α a C^1-small 1-from on $Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})$ we define

$$\mathcal{F}_{Y,\epsilon}(\alpha, b) := \alpha^* \Phi_Y^* \Phi_b^* \Delta_\epsilon^* \widetilde{\Psi}_x^* \operatorname{Im} \widetilde{\Omega} / \eta_\epsilon^*(w_\epsilon dV_\epsilon)$$

so that for $u = (a, b) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ we have $\eta_\epsilon^* \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(u) = \mathcal{F}_{Y,\epsilon}(\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a, b)$. We put $\mathcal{Q}_{Y,\epsilon} := \mathcal{F}_{Y,\epsilon} - \mathcal{F}_{Y,\epsilon}(\mathbf{0}) - \mathcal{L}_{Y,\epsilon}$ (where $\mathcal{L}_{Y,\epsilon}$ linearizes $\mathcal{F}_{Y,\epsilon}$ at $\mathbf{0}$ pointwise on $Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})$) so that for $u = (a, b) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ we have

$$\eta_\epsilon^* \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u) = \mathcal{Q}_{Y,\epsilon}(\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a, b). \tag{14.21}$$

The definition of weight functions implies that if $u_0, u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ and if we put $f = \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_1) - \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(u_0)$ then

$$\|f\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\eta_\epsilon(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})))} \approx \epsilon^{-\nu+2} \|\eta_\epsilon^* f\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4}))}. \tag{14.22}$$

Now for $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and α a 1-form on $Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})$ we define

$$\|(\alpha, b)\| := \|\alpha\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4}))} + |b| \tag{14.23}$$

where $|\bullet|$ is as in (13.1) so that for $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$\|(\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a, b)\| \leqslant \epsilon^{-2+\nu} \|(a, b)\|_\epsilon. \tag{14.24}$$

One then proves that if $b_0, b_1 \in \mathcal{B}$, if α_0, α_1 are C^1-small 1-forms on $Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4})$ and if we put $w_0 = (\alpha_0, b_0)$, $w_1 = (\alpha_1, b_1)$ then

$$\|\mathcal{Q}_{Y,\epsilon}(w_1) - \mathcal{Q}_{Y,\epsilon}(w_0)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4}))} \lesssim \|w_1 - w_0\|(\|w_1\| + \|w_0\|). \tag{14.25}$$

This involves of course the effects of $b_0, b_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ and the asymptotic analysis at the singular point of Y; but it is still straight-forward to prove that (14.25) holds up to an ϵ-dependent constant. That constant may be eliminated as in the proof of (14.19).

Combining (14.21), (14.22), (14.24) and (14.25) we get (14.14) with $c_\epsilon = \epsilon^{\nu-2}$ over $\eta_\epsilon(Y' \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_4}))$. This completes the proof of Theorem 13.5 (ii).

14.3 Proof of Theorem 13.5 (iii)

Theorem 13.5 (iii) claims that

$$\|(a, b)\|_\epsilon \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a, b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \text{ for all } (a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B} \tag{14.26}$$

or in other words the linear operator $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon : \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{V}_\epsilon$ is ϵ-uniformly invertible. We therefore approximate $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ by the sum of certain ϵ-independent linear operators $\mathcal{L}_X : \mathcal{A}_X \to C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X'; \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{L}_Y : \mathcal{A}_Y \oplus \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{V}_Y$. We shall first use $\mathcal{L}_X, \mathcal{L}_Y$ to prove (14.26) in the following two cases respectively:

(I) $b = 0$ and a vanishes on $\eta_\epsilon(Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_5}))$; **(II)** a is supported in $\eta_\epsilon(Y^\epsilon)$.

In general a satisfies neither of these two conditions but, as a is an *exact* 1-form on $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$, we can decompose a into two exact 1-forms satisfying the two conditions above respectively.

This process will of course cause some error terms which, however, will be controllable for ϵ small enough; the underlying mechanism may be seen more clearly in Donaldson–Kronheimer's exposition [9, §7.2.2] (of Taubes' gluing construction [29] in Yang–Mills gauge theory).

We begin now with the definition of $\mathcal{L}_X : \mathcal{A}_X \to C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X';\mathbb{R})$. We define $\mathcal{A}_X$ as the set of all exact 1-forms on X' of weighted Hölder class $C^{1,\beta}_\nu$ in the notation of §11. One easily sees that $\mathcal{A}_X$ is a Banach space with respect to the $C^{1,\beta}_\nu$-norm. Let $w_X : X' \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be as in §12. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_X$ we set

$$\mathcal{L}_X\alpha := -w_X^{-1}d^*_X(w_X\alpha) \tag{14.27}$$

where d^*_X denotes the formal adjoint of d with respect to the conical metric on X' (in the terminology of §11) so that for $a \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ vanishing on $\eta_\epsilon(Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_5}))$ we have $\mathcal{L}_X\Pi_{N*}a = \Pi_{N*}\mathcal{L}_\epsilon a$.

Clearly $\mathcal{L}_X$ is a bounded linear map of $\mathcal{A}_X$ into $C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X';\mathbb{R})$. Lemma 12.1 immediately implies that $\mathcal{L}_X : \mathcal{A}_X \to C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X';\mathbb{R})$ is a linear isomorphism. By Open Mapping Theorem its inverse is bounded as well so that

$$\|\alpha\|_{C^{1,\beta}_\nu(X')} \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_X\alpha\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X')} \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_X. \tag{14.28}$$

Consequently for $a \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ vanishing on $\eta_\epsilon(Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_5}))$ we have

$$\|(a,0)\|_\epsilon = \|\Pi_{N*}a\|_{C^{1,\beta}_\nu(X')} \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_X\Pi_{N*}a\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\nu-2}(X')} = \|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,0)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)}.$$

This implies (14.26) in Case (I) above.

We turn now to Case (II). We first define an operator $\mathcal{L}_Y : \mathcal{A}_Y \oplus \mathcal{B} \to C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y';\mathbb{R})$. We define $\mathcal{A}_Y$ as the set of all exact 1-forms α on Y' of class $C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}$ in the notation of §11. For $(\alpha,b) \in \mathcal{A}_Y \oplus \mathcal{B}$ we set

$$\mathcal{L}_Y(\alpha,b) = -w_Y^{-1}d^*_Y w_Y(\alpha + dH'_b) \tag{14.29}$$

where $H'_b : Y' \to \mathbb{R}$ is as in (13.6), and d^*_Y denotes the formal adjoint of d with respect to the conical metric on Y (in the terminology of §11).

Clearly $\mathcal{L}_Y$ is a bounded linear map of $\mathcal{A}_Y \oplus \mathcal{B}$ into $C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y';\mathbb{R})$. An integration-by-parts shows that $\mathcal{L}_Y$ maps into the codimension-one linear subspace $\mathcal{V}_Y \subset C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y';\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$\mathcal{V}_Y := \{f \in C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y';\mathbb{R}) : \textstyle\int_Y w_Y f\, dV_Y = 0\}. \tag{14.30}$$

The map $\mathcal{L}_Y : \mathcal{A}_Y \oplus \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{V}_Y$ is in fact a *linear isomorphism*; its proof will be left to the reader as the key ingredients are all contained in the proofs of Lemma 12.1 and Theorem 13.3.

Again by Open Mapping Theorem we have

$$\|\alpha\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y')} + |b| \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_Y(\alpha,b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y')} \text{ for all } (\alpha,b) \in \mathcal{A}_Y \oplus \mathcal{B}.$$

Hence, for $(a,b) \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon \oplus \mathcal{B}$ with a supported in $\eta_\epsilon(Y^\epsilon)$, we get

$$\|\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y')} + |b| \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_Y(\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a, b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y')}. \tag{14.31}$$

An elementary computation using (14.29), (13.7) and (14.1) with $k=2$ shows

$$\|\mathcal{L}_Y(\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a, b) - \eta_\epsilon^* \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y')} \lesssim \epsilon^{\lambda-\nu}(\|\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y')} + |b|). \tag{14.32}$$

Making ϵ small enough we find from (14.31)–(14.32) that

$$\|\epsilon^{-2}\eta_\epsilon^* a\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(Y')} + |b| \lesssim \|\eta_\epsilon^* \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(Y')}.$$

This is equivalent to (14.26) as a is supported in $\eta_\epsilon(Y^\epsilon)$ and so (14.26) holds in Case (II) above.

Now we prove (14.26) in the general case. We take an ϵ-independent point $x_* \in \Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x) \subset \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ in the connected component of $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$ containing the unique singular point of $\widetilde{X}_\epsilon$. We have then a *unique* smooth function $f_a : \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f_a(x_*) = 0$ and $df_a = a$. We put $f_{a,b} := f_a + \epsilon^2 H'_b$ so that

$$\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b) = -d_\epsilon^*(w_\epsilon \cos\phi_\epsilon df_{a,b}) \tag{14.33}$$

by (13.7). We also find from (13.1) that

$$\|df_{a,b}\|_{C^{1,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)} \lesssim \|(a,b)\|_\epsilon. \tag{14.34}$$

We put $A_\epsilon := \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \cap \widetilde{\Psi}_x(\widetilde{U}_x \setminus \Pi_Q^{-1}(\overline{B_{5\epsilon}}))$ which is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}\times T^2$ and whose distance from the point x_* is $\lesssim (-\log\epsilon)$ with respect to the *cylindrical* metric on $\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon$ (in the terminology of §10). Consequently

$$\|f_{a,b}\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(A_\epsilon)} \lesssim (-\log\epsilon)\|df_{a,b}\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu,\nu}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon)}. \tag{14.35}$$

We can also take a smooth function $\chi_\epsilon : \widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \to [0,1]$ with the following three properties: (i) $\chi_\epsilon \equiv 1$ on $\eta_\epsilon(Y \cap \Pi_Q^{-1}(B_{5\epsilon}))$; (ii) $\chi_\epsilon \equiv 0$ on $\Pi_N^{-1}(X \setminus V_x)$; (iii) the derivatives $\nabla^k\chi_\epsilon$ (with respect to the cylindrical metric) are all supported in A_ϵ with

$$\|\nabla^k\chi_\epsilon\|_{C^{0,\beta}(A_\epsilon)} \lesssim (-\log\epsilon)^{-k},\ k = 0,1,2,\cdots. \tag{14.36}$$

We put $a_X := d(1-\chi_\epsilon)f_a$ and $a_Y := d(\chi_\epsilon f_a)$ which clearly satisfy the conditions of (I), (II) above respectively so that

$$\|(a,b)\|_\epsilon \lesssim \|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a_X,0)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \setminus \eta_\epsilon(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5)))} + \|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a_Y,b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\eta_\epsilon(Y^\epsilon))}. \tag{14.37}$$

The three estimates (14.34)–(14.36) readily imply

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a_X,0) - \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\widetilde{X}'_\epsilon \setminus \eta_\epsilon(Y\cap\Pi_Q^{-1}(B_5)))} \lesssim (-\log\epsilon)^{-1}\|(a,0)\|_\epsilon. \tag{14.38}$$

In addition to (14.34)–(14.36) we use (14.1) with $k=2$ to get

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a_Y,b) - \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a,b)\|_{C^{0,\beta}_{\mu-2,\nu-2}(\eta_\epsilon(Y^\epsilon))} \lesssim (-\log\epsilon)^{-1}\|(a,b)\|_\epsilon. \tag{14.39}$$

We may of course suppose ϵ so small that $(-\log\epsilon)^{-1} < \frac{1}{100}$ for instance. We then immediately get (14.26) from the three estimates (14.37)–(14.39).

This completes the proof of Theorem 13.5 (iii) and consequently of Theorem 4.2 (as in Corollary 13.6).

References

[1] P. Candelas, X. C. de la Ossa *'Comments on conifolds'* Nuclear Phys. **B342** (1990) 246–268

[2] Y.-M. Chan *'Calabi–Yau and special Lagrangian 3-folds with conical singularities and their desingularizations'* Oxford D. Phil. thesis 2005 available at
`https://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/joyce/theses/theses.html`

[3] Y.-M. Chan *'Desingularizations of Calabi–Yau 3-folds with a conical singularity'* Q. J. Math. **57** (2006) 151–181

[4] Y.-M. Chan *'Simultaneous desingularizations of Calabi–Yau and special Lagrangian 3-folds with conical singularities. I. The gluing construction'* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **35** (2009) 91–114

[5] Y.-M. Chan *'Simultaneous desingularizations of Calabi–Yau and special Lagrangian 3-folds with conical singularities. II. Examples'* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **35** (2009) 157–180

[6] Y.-M. Chan *'Desingularizations of Calabi–Yau 3-folds with conical singularities. II. The obstructed case'* Q. J. Math. **60** (2009) 1–44

[7] A. Corti, M. Haskins, J. Nordström, T. Pacini *'Asymptotically cylindrical Calabi–Yau 3-folds from weak Fano 3-folds'* Geom. Topol. 17 (2013) 1955–2059

[8] A. Corti, M. Haskins, J. Nordström, T. Pacini 'G_2-manifolds and associative submanifolds via semi-Fano 3-folds' Duke Math. J. **164** (2015) 1971–2092

[9] S. K. Donaldson, P. B. Kronheimer *'The geometry of four-manifolds'* Oxford Science Publications 1990

[10] R. Harvey, H. B. Lawson *'Calibrated geometries'* Acta Math. **148** (1982) 47–157

[11] M. Haskins *'The geometric complexity of special Lagrangian T^2-cones'* Invent. Math **157** (2004) 11-70

[12] J. Hempel *'3-Manifolds'* Ann. of Math. Studies **86** Princeton University Press 1976

[13] Y. Imagi *'Surjectivity of a gluing for stable T^2-cones in special Lagrangian geometry'* preprint arXiv:1102.4309

[14] M. Ionel, M. Min-Oo *'Cohomogeneity one special Lagrangian* 3*-folds in the deformed and the resolved conifolds'* Illinois J. Math. **52** (2008) 839–865

[15] D. D. Joyce *'On counting special Lagrangian homology* 3*-spheres'* Topology and geometry: commemorating SISTAG 125–151 Contemp. Math. **314** Amer. Math. Soc. Providence RI (2002)

[16] D. D. Joyce *'Singularities of special Lagrangian fibrations and the SYZ conjecture'* Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003) 859–907

[17] D. D. Joyce *'Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. I. Regularity'* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **25** (2003) 201–258

[18] D. D. Joyce *'Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. II. Moduli spaces'* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **25** (2004) 301–352

[19] D. D. Joyce *'Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. III. Desingularization, the unobstructed case'* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **26** (2004) 1–58

[20] D. D. Joyce *'Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. IV. Desingularization, obstructions and families'* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **26** (2004) 117–174

[21] D. D. Joyce *'Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. V. Survey and applications'* J. Differential Geom. **63** (2003) 279–347

[22] Y.-I. Lee *'Embedded special Lagrangian submanifolds in Calabi–Yau manifolds'* Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003) 391–423

[23] R. B. Lockhart, R. C. McOwen *'Elliptic differential operators on noncompact manifolds'* Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **12** (1985) 409–447

[24] S. P. Marshall *'Deformations of special Lagrangian submanifolds'* Oxford D. Phil. thesis 2002 available at
`https://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/joyce/theses/theses.html`

[25] R. C. McLean *'Deformations of calibrated submanifolds'* Comm. Anal. Geom. **6** (1998) 705–747

[26] J. Moser *'On the volume elements on a manifold'* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **120** (1965) 286–294

[27] T. Pacini *'Special Lagrangian conifolds, II: gluing constructions in* $\mathbb{C}^m$*'* Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **107** (2013) 225–266

[28] S. Tanno *'Geodesic flows on* C_L*-manifolds and Einstein metrics on* $S^3 \times S^2$*'* in *'Minimal submanifolds and geodesics'* edited by M. Obata, Kaigai Publications Ltd. 1978

[29] C. H. Taubes *'Self-dual Yang-Mills connections on non-self-dual* 4*-manifolds'* J. Differential Geom. **17** (1982) 139–170